

FEB 18 1957

Bulletin

Vol. XXXVI, No. 920

February 11, 1957

THE PRICE OF PEACE • <i>Second Inaugural Address of President Eisenhower</i>	211
THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC SITUATION • <i>Excerpts From Economic Report of the President</i>	222
THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TURKISH-AMERICAN CULTURAL RELATIONS TO THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF TURKEY • <i>by Ambassador Fletcher Warren</i>	214
GENERAL ASSEMBLY CONSIDERATION OF THE PROBLEM OF DISARMAMENT • <i>Statements by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., and Texts of Resolution and U.S. Memorandum</i>	225
THE QUESTION OF A WORLD FOOD RESERVE • <i>Statement by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey and Text of Resolution</i>	233
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES • <i>Statement by Paul G. Hoffman</i>	236

For index see inside back cover

OFFICIAL

WEEKLY RECORD

UNITED STATES

FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XXXVI, No. 920 • PUBLICATION 6448

February 11, 1957

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 19, 1955).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The Price of Peace

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER, JANUARY 21, 1957

White House press release dated January 21

We meet again, as upon a like moment 4 years ago, and again you have witnessed my solemn oath of service to you.

I, too, am a witness today testifying in your name to the principles and purposes to which we as a people are pledged.

Before all else we seek, upon our common labor as a nation, the favor of Almighty God. And the hopes in our hearts fashion the deepest prayers of our people.

May we pursue the right—without self-righteousness.

May we know unity—without conformity.

May we grow in strength—without pride of self.

May we, in our dealings with all peoples of the earth, ever speak truth and serve justice.

And so shall America—in the sight of all men of good will—prove true to the honorable purposes that bind and rule us as a people in all this time of trial through which we pass.

II.

We live in a land of plenty, but rarely has this earth known such peril as today.

In our Nation work and wealth abound. Our population grows. Commerce crowds our rivers and rails, our skies, harbors, and highways. Our soil is fertile; our agriculture productive. The air rings with the song of our industry—rolling mills and blast furnaces, dynamos, dams, and assembly lines—the chorus of America the bountiful.

This is our home, yet this is not the whole of our world. For our world is where our full destiny lies—with men, of all peoples and all nations,

who are or would be free. And for them, and so for us, this is no time of ease or rest.

In too much of the earth there is want, discord, danger. New forces and new nations stir and strive across the earth, with power to bring, by their fate, great good or great evil to the free world's future. From the deserts of North Africa to the islands of the South Pacific, one-third of all mankind has entered upon an historic struggle for a new freedom: freedom from grinding poverty. Across all continents nearly a billion people seek, sometimes almost in desperation, for the skills and knowledge and assistance by which they may satisfy, from their own resources, the material wants common to all mankind.

No nation, however old or great, escapes this tempest of change and turmoil. Some, impoverished by the recent World War, seek to restore their means of livelihood. In the heart of Europe Germany still stands tragically divided. So is the whole continent divided. And so, too, is all the world.

The divisive force is international communism and the power that it controls.

The designs of that power, dark in purpose, are clear in practice. It strives to seal forever the fate of those it has enslaved. It strives to break the ties that unite the free. And it strives to capture—to exploit for its own greater power—all forces of change in the world, especially the needs of the hungry and the hopes of the oppressed.

Yet the world of international communism has itself been shaken by a fierce and mighty force: the readiness of men who love freedom to pledge their lives to that love. Through the night of their bondage the unconquerable will of heroes

has struck with the swift, sharp thrust of lightning. Budapest is no longer merely the name of a city; henceforth it is a new and shining symbol of man's yearning to be free.

Thus across all the globe there harshly blow the winds of change. And we, though fortunate be our lot, know that we can never turn our back to them.

III.

We look upon this shaken earth, and we declare our firm and fixed purpose—the building of a peace with justice in a world where moral law prevails.

The building of such a peace is a bold and solemn purpose. To proclaim it is easy. To serve it will be hard. And to attain it, we must be aware of its full meaning and ready to pay its full price.

We know clearly what we seek and why.

We seek peace, knowing, as all ages of man have known, that peace is the climate of freedom. And now, as in no other age, we seek it because we have been warned by the power of modern weapons that peace may be the only climate possible for human life itself.

Yet this peace we seek cannot be born of fear alone; it must be rooted in the lives of nations. There must be justice, sensed and shared by all peoples, for without justice the world can know only a tense and unstable truce. There must be law, steadily invoked and respected by all nations, for without law the world promises only such meager justice as the pity of the strong upon the weak. But the law of which we speak, comprehending the values of freedom, affirms the equality of all nations, great and small.

Splendid as can be the blessings of such a peace, high will be its cost—in toil patiently sustained, in help honorably given, in sacrifice calmly borne.

We are called to meet the price of this peace.

To counter the threat of those who seek to rule by force, we must pay the costs of our own needed military strength and help to build the security of others.

We must use our skills and knowledge and, at times, our substance to help others rise from misery, however far the scene of suffering may be from our shores. For wherever in the world a people knows desperate want, there must appear at least the spark of hope—the hope of progress—or there will surely rise at last the flames of conflict.

We recognize and accept our own deep involvement in the destiny of men everywhere. We are accordingly pledged to honor and to strive to fortify the authority of the United Nations. For in that body rests the best hope of our age for the assertion of that law by which all nations may live in dignity.

And beyond this general resolve we are called to act a responsible role in the world's great concerns or conflicts—whether they touch upon the affairs of a vast region, the fate of an island in the Pacific, or the use of a canal in the Middle East. Only in respecting the hopes and cultures of others will we practice the equality of all nations. Only as we show willingness and wisdom in giving counsel, in receiving counsel, and in sharing burdens will we wisely perform the work of peace.

For one truth must rule all we think and all we do. No people can live to itself alone. The unity of all who dwell in freedom is their only sure defense. The economic need of all nations, in mutual dependence, makes isolation an impossibility; not even America's prosperity could long survive if other nations did not also prosper. No nation can longer be a fortress, lone and strong and safe. And any people seeking such shelter for themselves can now build only their prison.

IV.

Our pledge to these principles is constant because we believe in their rightness.

We do not fear this world of change. America is no stranger to much of its spirit. Everywhere we see the seeds of the same growth that America itself has known. The American experiment has for generations fired the passion and the courage of millions elsewhere seeking freedom, equality, and opportunity. And the American story of material progress has helped excite the longing of all needy peoples for some satisfaction of their human wants. These hopes that we have helped to inspire we can help to fulfill.

In this confidence we speak plainly to all peoples.

We cherish our friendship with all nations that are or would be free. We respect, no less, their independence. And when, in time of want or peril, they ask our help, they may honorably receive it; for we no more seek to buy their sovereignty than we would sell our own. Sovereignty is never bartered among free men.

We honor the aspirations of those nations

which, now captive, long for freedom. We seek neither their military alliance nor any artificial imitation of our society. And they can know the warmth of the welcome that awaits them when, as must be, they join again the ranks of freedom.

We honor, no less in this divided world than in a less tormented time, the people of Russia. We do not dread—rather do we welcome—their progress in education and industry. We wish them success in their demands for more intellectual freedom, greater security before their own laws, fuller enjoyment of the rewards of their own toil. For as such things may come to pass, the more certain will be the coming of that day when our peoples may freely meet in friendship.

So we voice our hope and our belief that we can help to heal this divided world. Thus may the nations cease to live in trembling before the menace of force. Thus may the weight of fear and the weight of arms be taken from the burdened shoulders of mankind.

This, nothing less, is the labor to which we are called and our strength dedicated.

And so the prayer of our people carries far beyond our own frontiers to the wide world of our duty and our destiny.

May the light of freedom coming to all darkened lands flame brightly, until at last the darkness is no more.

May the turbulence of our age yield to a true time of peace, when men and nations shall share a life that honors the dignity of each, the brotherhood of all.

Rumanian Refusal To Admit U.S. Election Observers

Press release 36 dated January 24

The Rumanian Government has refused to authorize a proposed visit to Rumania by three American political scientists to observe Rumanian national parliamentary elections scheduled for February 3, 1957. Although it had previously

agreed to a reciprocal exchange of election observers and in accordance with this agreement had sent three Rumanian political scientists and publicists to the United States to witness the American national elections, the Rumanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has now informed the American Minister in Bucharest, Robert H. Thayer, that it does not consider a reciprocal visit by American political scientists appropriate at this time. The Rumanian refusal was made on January 19 in reply to a notification to the Ministry in Bucharest on January 16, 1957, that the American observers were prepared to depart.

An invitation to exchange election observers in the interest of promoting greater mutual understanding had been extended to the Rumanian Government in Bucharest on September 20, 1956.¹ In a reply dated October 5, 1956, the Rumanian Government accepted the invitation to send observers to the United States and said that it was prepared to facilitate a similar visit to Rumania by American observers on the occasion of elections to the Rumanian parliament.² Three Rumanian observers subsequently visited the United States and were accorded full opportunity to observe the election procedures in this country.³ The U.S. Government regrets the decision of the Rumanian Government not to honor its agreement to admit U.S. election observers on a reciprocal basis.

The American political scientists who had sought permission to proceed to Rumania were Prof. James K. Pollack, President of the International Political Science Association and Chairman of the Department of Political Science of the University of Michigan; Richard M. Scammon, Director of Elections Research, Governmental Affairs Institute, Washington, D. C.; and Prof. Henry L. Roberts, Director, Program on East Central Europe, Columbia University.

¹ BULLETIN of Oct. 8, 1956, p. 550.

² *Ibid.*, Oct. 29, 1956, p. 665.

³ For an announcement on the proposed itinerary for the Rumanian observers, see *ibid.*, Nov. 5, 1956, p. 728.

The Contributions of Turkish-American Cultural Relations to the Economic Development of Turkey

by Fletcher Warren
Ambassador to Turkey¹

I have chosen a subject of rather wide and general interest and one which has particular significance for a business group. All of us these days are conscious of the splendid progress which Turkey has made in the economic field in the past 30 years. I should think, however, that not many of us have stopped to think seriously about the part that education plays in the economic growth of this country. Probably few of us are conscious of the part Turkish-American cooperation in the field of education and general cultural relations has played in recent economic development in Turkey.

Turkish-American cooperation in the educational field goes back a number of years, certainly to the foundation of Robert College in the 1860's. Many of you here today are not strangers to the work of the American schools and colleges in Turkey. I think I need not dwell on this subject. I understand that Dr. Ballantine² spoke earlier this year on development plans of Robert College. Suffice to say, I have already noticed, as I learn about Turkey and as I meet Turkish leaders in many walks of life, that graduates of the American colleges in Turkey are playing a vital role in the development of this country. We find them everywhere, but particularly in the economic and technical pursuits, both in government and in private enterprise, which are so important to the modernization of Turkey. We must not overlook the contributions made to the development of modern Turkey by graduates of the Istanbul

American Girls College and other American schools for women in Turkey. Alumnae of these schools have been outstanding leaders in the change in status of women in modern Turkey which has been so admired by other countries.

Working Partnership in Education

Since the end of World War II, Turkish national educational institutions have come into close contact and working partnership with the United States. Beginning with the inauguration of the Fulbright program in 1951, American teachers and professors have come to schools and universities in Turkey in fairly large numbers to teach many subjects important to the growth of this country. Engineering, economics, business administration, psychology, educational methodology, American literature and the English language, atomic physics, sociology, and international law are just a few of the fields in which American scholars have specialized at Turkish educational institutions. Teachers and professors from Turkey, on the other hand, have done graduate work and carried out research in similar fields in the United States. Significantly, these Turkish scholars have also lectured to Americans about Turkey, contributing to a growing knowledge in the United States of modern Turkey.

This year the Fulbright program is being reactivated by the Governments of our two countries. We look forward hopefully to continuation of this splendid educational exchange.

With the inauguration of American economic aid to Turkey in 1948, there was an added incentive for the U.S. Government to have an in-

¹ Address made before the Istanbul Propellor Club at Istanbul, Turkey, on Dec. 4.

² Duncan Smith Ballantine, president of Robert College.

terest in the development of education in Turkey. Without a good, practical educational base no country can grow rapidly, either economically or militarily. It is for this reason that the American Government welcomed the suggestion of President Celal Bayar that a land-grant type of university be founded in the eastern provinces of Turkey. State universities of this type have played a significant role in the development of the United States, particularly in the western part of our country. We hope that the efforts now being undertaken by the Turkish Government with the assistance of Nebraska University and the International Cooperation Administration's Special Mission to Turkey will lead to similar results.

Even while organization of the new Ataturk University for the East is going forward, representatives of Nebraska University are already working fruitfully with the Faculty of Agriculture of Ankara University. Everything that can be done to improve Turkish agriculture through scientific study and university extension work must be done if Turkey is to progress as rapidly as it is hoped.

Interest in Public Administration

The field of public administration has also interested the Turkish and American Governments as they work together to strengthen the Turkish economy. Turkey has a long and distinguished past as a leader in the public administration field. The administrative system of the Ottoman government was a marvel of its day. The experience of Turkey can contribute much to the study of administration as a science. On the other hand, in the United States particular thought has been given to the role of organization, administration, and management in modern governmental institutions. Today the interests of our two countries in the science of administration have been brought together under a cooperative Ankara University-New York University project in the Faculties of Law and Political Science in Ankara. The results of this scientific approach to administration may indeed prove significant in Turkey, where the leadership of government has been so important to developmental efforts.

The extensive activities in technical assistance in many fields under the American economic-aid program to Turkey are too numerous to mention

here, nor can we give more than passing reference to the importance of skills acquired in military service by many Turks under the Turkish-American program for modernizing the Turkish Army, Navy, and Air Force. All over Turkey technical skills learned in the Army are being put to work in economic activities. The importance of the Army as a school cannot be overemphasized.

Turkish Studies in the U.S.

Turkish-American cooperation in the cultural field has not only been a one-way proposition. An interesting aspect of the American educational system has been the recent development of Turkish studies in the United States. Outstanding universities such as Princeton, Columbia, Michigan, Johns Hopkins, and Stanford all have courses on the development of modern Turkey. The fact that private educational institutions in America are playing a major role in educational exchange between the two countries is a clear-cut demonstration of the interest and faith of Americans in the development of Turkey. The Ford Foundation each year grants fellowships to a number of American graduate students to study some aspects of the development of Turkey. In fact, we can say that there is worldwide scientific interest in the efforts of this country to modernize. In recognition of this fact, the Rockefeller Foundation has made grants to Turkish scholars to write about Turkey or to visit the United States and other countries to lecture on such subjects as Turkish music, drama, or art.

The American foundations have also played a major part in educational projects in Turkey. The Ford Foundation has given substantial assistance for the creation of an Institute of Business Administration at Istanbul University. They have helped the American Academy for Girls at Uskudar to introduce a domestic-science program. Most significantly, the Ford Foundation is helping the Turkish Government to attack the basic problem of developing a curriculum for its educational system which is in keeping with the needs of an expanding economy and rapidly developing country.

In connection with my trip to Istanbul to speak to you today, I have visited several of the Turkish-American educational projects that are found in the city. I should like to single out two of these for particular note.

Yesterday morning I visited the Ataturk Girls Lycée, which has introduced an experimental secondary-school curriculum with the approval of the Ministry of Education and the assistance of the Ford Foundation and a representative of the University of Illinois. This program permits the student to choose certain subjects as electives in addition to the basic courses which she must take. The courses themselves are being remodeled to suit the needs of young women going out into the world of Turkey today. As part of this program, the parents of the students in the experimental project were invited to the school and were given an explanation of what was being attempted. I was told that this is perhaps the first time that parents in Turkey have been asked to comment on the school program which is offered their children. The interest of the parents astounded the teachers and the Ministry of Education officials concerned. When the Ministry's budget would not cover the preparation of laboratories for the teaching of scientific subjects, the parents voluntarily collected the money needed, had the basement rooms of the school redecorated, and arranged for the installation of fluorescent lights and gas and water for use in scientific experimentation.

Specialized Education for Businessmen

Another project which I visited this morning is the special training course which is being held by the Institute of Business Administration of Istanbul University for employees of business firms. This type of specialized education for in-service businessmen is completely new for this country. The keen spirit of the 34 men attending this program is proof in itself of the practicability of the project.

I have cited these two instances of educational development not merely to indicate how Turkish-American cooperation has benefited this country but to indicate to you businessmen possible channels of activity for yourselves. You, the business and professional men of our two countries, have a basic responsibility for helping the educators to do their work well. They need community support as well as guidance. The success of the educational system of Turkey will contribute much to your own business success. It will certainly contribute much to the strength of this country in which you have invested. It is not enough to wait

for government to produce the proper type of practical education for the successful growth of a country. Businessmen must work with government to make sure that the best is attained. The Turkish Government is vigorously attacking the educational problems of this country. We on the American Government's side, with our sincere interest in Turkish development, can assure you that we will help wherever we can. It is up to you, however, to take the lead in supplying ideas and direction for educational and cultural development in accordance with the needs of this country as you see them in your everyday affairs. The investment of your time and resources in this field is an investment in the future and an expression of faith in this country.

Moslem Members of Baghdad Pact Consider Middle East Situation

Following is the text of a communique issued at Ankara, Turkey, on January 21 by the Prime Ministers of Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, and Turkey.

The Prime Ministers of the four Moslem powers of the Baghdad Pact met at Ankara the 19th and 20th of January 1957, in the presence of the President of the Republic of Turkey and His Royal Highness the Crown Prince of Iraq. The Foreign Ministers of Iran, Iraq and Turkey also attended the meetings.

The conference reviewed the international situation, particularly the developments that have taken place in the Middle East, since their last meeting at Baghdad in November 1956.

They noted with satisfaction the complete withdrawal of Anglo-French forces from Egyptian territory in deference to United Nations resolutions and the recommendations of the four Baghdad Pact powers' conference at Tehran.

They welcomed the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly calling upon Israel once again to withdraw all her forces behind the armistice lines. They felt that the maintenance of peace in this area should be the continuing responsibility of the United Nations. They called for early settlement of the Palestine question through the United Nations, which should take into consideration the legitimate rights of the Arabs. They expressed the hope that the question of freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal,

consistent with Egyptian sovereignty, should be insured in accordance with the Convention of 1888 and that the canal should be insulated from the national politics of any one power. They considered statements made in certain quarters on the subject of the Suez Canal as designed to confuse the issue and prejudice settlement of the question being reached.

After taking stock of the situation in the general area of the Middle East since their last meeting, the four powers came to the conclusion that subversive activities aimed at the destruction of established law and order continue unabated. They agreed that vigorous steps should be taken to meet the challenge of false and subversive propaganda.

They noted with satisfaction that President Eisenhower's plan for the Middle East recognizes the threat posed by Communist aggression and subversion to countries of the Middle East. They fully support the measures outlined in the plan, as it stands at present, as best designed to maintain peace in the area and advance the economic well-being of the people. They note with gratification that the plan is not designed to create spheres of influence nor to enslave the peoples of the Middle East. In that connection, they emphasized once again the importance and usefulness of the Baghdad Pact in the interests of the entire region and world peace.

They deplored the destruction of the pipeline in Syria which by interrupting the flow of oil has disrupted the economies of the countries affected and consequently brought about grave hardship and suffering. They urged the early restoration of the pipeline, and regret that such restoration is being delayed.

World Bank Makes First Loan to Iran

The World Bank announced on January 23 that it has made a loan equivalent to \$75 million to Iran to provide short-term financing required for Iran's second Seven-Year Development Plan. It is the bank's first loan to Iran.

The Bank of America, Irving Trust Company, and Manufacturers Trust Company are participating in the loan, without the World Bank's guaranty, in the total amount of \$3.5 million of

the first maturity, which falls due on September 15, 1959.

Iran's second Seven-Year Plan encompasses a wide range of projects and programs for the development of agriculture, transport, electric power, industry, and social services. The plan is being administered by the Plan Organization, an independent government agency, and is being financed mainly out of oil revenues.

Iran embarked on its first Seven-Year Development Plan in 1948, but when oil production was drastically curtailed in 1951 development activities had to be abandoned for about 4 years. After oil revenues again became available late in 1954 following an agreement with a consortium of foreign oil companies, it became possible to resume development activities on a substantial scale and a second Seven-Year Development Plan was formulated.

The portion of Iran's oil revenues allocated to the Plan Organization is expected to exceed the equivalent of \$1,000 million during the 7-year period from September 1955 to September 1962. These revenues should be sufficient to cover the expenditure now programed over the 7-year period. However, since oil production can only gradually be restored, the revenues during the early years of the Plan are expected to fall somewhat short of the expenditure to be undertaken in those years; in the later years, on the other hand, the revenues will be much more ample.

The World Bank loan is being made to enable Iran to anticipate some of these future revenues and thus to proceed with programs and projects which would otherwise have to be delayed until the later years of the Plan. The proceeds of the loan will be made available to assist in financing Plan expenditures during the period from August 21, 1956, to March 20, 1958, or such later date as may subsequently be agreed upon.

The loan is for a term of less than 6 years; semi-annual amortization payments will commence September 15, 1959, and are scheduled to retire the loan by September 15, 1962. The rate of interest will be 5 percent, including the 1 percent commission charged by the bank. The loan is a general obligation of Iran. In addition, arrangements have been made for servicing the loan from oil revenues allocated to the Plan Organization.

After having been approved by the bank's Executive Directors, the loan agreement was

signed on January 22 by Dr. Ali Amini, Ambassador of Iran to the United States, on behalf of Iran, and by W. A. B. Iliff, vice president, on behalf of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Question of Cotton Textile Exports to United States

JAPANESE PROGRAM FOR CONTROL OF COTTON EXPORTS

Press release 25 dated January 16

The U.S. Government was informed on January 16 by the Government of Japan, in a note from the Ambassador of Japan to the Secretary of State,¹ concerning the details of the Japanese program for the control of exports of cotton textiles to the United States.

This program, effective as of January 1, 1957, has a 5-year duration. The details were developed pursuant to a note submitted to the U.S. Government by the Government of Japan on September 27, 1956.²

The new program places an annual overall ceiling of 235 million square yards on the export of all types of Japanese cotton cloth and cotton manufactures to the United States, with specific ceilings on many items.

The Departments of State, Commerce, and Agriculture issued the following joint statement commenting on the new Japanese program:

The action taken by Japan is a major step forward in the development of orderly and mutually beneficial trade between the United States and Japan. It is a constructive measure aimed at forestalling possible future injury to the United States cotton textile industry. It recognizes the problem faced by various segments of the domestic industry and meets this problem through the voluntary exercise of restraint on exports of cotton textiles to the American market.

The program demonstrates an understanding by Japan of the importance of the orderly marketing of an item as significant to the economies of both countries as cotton textiles. It not only provides an overall limit on the total volume of cotton textile exports to the United States, but, perhaps even more important, it sets a pattern for the diversification of these exports over the entire area of cotton textile manufactures. Under this program, it should be possible to avoid situations such as those

which developed during 1955 and 1956 in blouses, velveteens, and gingham.

The Japanese action provides a basis for the expansion of two-way trade between the United States and Japan in an atmosphere of the friendliest cooperation between the two nations, such as that which has characterized the economic and political relations between the two countries over the last decade.

For the United States cotton textile industry, the Japanese program should provide a basis on which it can look forward to the future with the confidence and the knowledge that import competition from Japan will follow an orderly pattern.

Officials of the several interested United States Government departments had the opportunity to hold a series of constructive discussions with representatives of the Japanese Government. Such discussions may be held from time to time, as needed, during the course of the program.

The overall ceiling for the export of cotton manufactures to the United States announced by the Japanese Government is 235 million square yards. Within this ceiling the limit for cotton cloth is 113 million yards; the limits for woven and knit apparel total 83 million yards; and the limits for household goods and miscellaneous items total 39 million yards.

The cloth ceiling of 113 million square yards compares with a ceiling of 150 million square yards in 1956. Individual ceilings are specified for velveteens, gingham, and high-grade (combed) cotton fabrics. The export limit for velveteen is 2.5 million square yards for each of the first 2 years. The export limit for gingham is 35 million square yards for each of the first 2 years. With respect to the remaining 75.5 million yards for "all other fabrics" a limit for high-grade (combed) cotton fabrics of 26 million square yards is established.

In the other groups covering cotton made-up goods, individual annual ceilings have been established for pillowcases, dish towels, handkerchiefs, table damask, blouses, sport shirts, dress and work shirts, brassieres and other body supporting garments, men's and boys' T-shirts, and gloves and mittens.

The program also provides for Japanese cotton textile exports to the United States to be distributed equally by quarters as far as practicable and as necessary to meet seasonal demands. The Japanese Government will also take all feasible steps to prevent transshipments to the United States through third countries.

The Japanese program has been developed in an

¹ Not printed.

² BULLETIN of Oct. 8, 1956, p. 554.

effort to meet the problems which arose in 1955 when exports of Japanese textiles to the United States increased sharply. These exports were heavily concentrated with respect to certain commodities such as blouses, velveteens, and gingham. Not only were the domestic producers of these items affected, but the entire textile industry became concerned because of the impact on the price structure of the industry and the uncertainty as to where other concentration of Japanese exports might hit.

The concern of the textile industry was expressed in a number of "escape clause" petitions filed with the Tariff Commission and in requests to the Congress and to the executive branch for action to establish quotas on imports of textiles.

More than a year ago, the executive branch of the U.S. Government began an extensive study of the problem with a view to finding a resolution which would provide appropriate safeguards for the domestic industry within the framework of established U.S. foreign trade policy.

One phase of the executive branch action involved factfinding and frequent consultation with representative United States cotton textile and apparel manufacturers. A second phase involved a series of discussions with representatives of the Japanese Government, aimed at exploring constructively measures which might alleviate the situation and at conveying to the Japanese Government a better appreciation of the nature of the American market and the desirability of a program of orderly marketing and sound merchandising.

On December 21, 1955, the Government of Japan announced a program for the voluntary control of exports of cotton goods to the United States in 1956. On May 16, 1956, the Japanese Government advised the United States officially of the details of the program and of its intention to exercise similar controls for 1957.

On September 27, 1956, the Japanese Government advised the United States as to the principles on which Japan intended to base its control of cotton textile exports to the United States for 1957 and subsequent years. This note set forth the principles of diversification of exports and avoidance of excessive concentration of exports in any particular period or on any particular item. The

5-year program now established represents the actual implementation of these principles.

U.S. DECISION NOT TO TAKE ESCAPE-CLAUSE ACTION

White House press release dated January 22

The President on January 22 announced that, in view of Japan's recent announcement of a broad program for the control of its cotton textile exports to the United States, he has decided not to take action on the recommendations of the U.S. Tariff Commission in the cotton-velveteen fabrics escape-clause case. In identical letters to the chairmen of the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees, the President said that the action by the Japanese Government, which includes a limitation on exports to the United States of cotton-velveteen fabrics, will provide relief for the domestic cotton-velveteen industry.

In its report dated October 24, 1956, the Tariff Commission recommended escape-clause relief in the form of a tariff increase on cotton-velveteen fabrics.¹ On December 21, 1956, the President informed the chairmen of the two committees that he was extending somewhat the period of his consideration of the cotton-velveteens case.²

President's Letter to Chairmen of Congressional Committees³

JANUARY 22, 1957

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On December 21, 1956 I informed you that I had found it necessary to extend somewhat the period of my consideration of the United States Tariff Commission's report of its findings and recommendations with respect to imports of cotton velveteen fabrics.

As you know, the Government of Japan on January 16, 1957 announced that it was undertaking a broad program for the control of its cotton textile exports, including cotton velveteen fabrics, to the United States.

¹ Copies of the report may be obtained from the U.S. Tariff Commission, Washington 25, D.C.

² BULLETIN of Jan. 21, 1957, p. 105.

³ Addressed to Senator Harry Flood Byrd, chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, and Representative Jere Cooper, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

In view of this action by the Japanese Government, which will provide relief for the domestic industry, I have decided not to take action on the recommendations of the Tariff Commission in this matter.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING ITALIAN EXPORT OF VELVETEENS

Press release 42 dated January 29

The Government of Italy informed the United States Government on January 17, 1957, that Italy intends to export no more than 1,375,000 square yards of velveteens to this country during the year 1957.

This information is being made public now in view of the number of inquiries received on this question.

Korean Exchange Rate Discussions

Press release 35 dated January 23

In connection with recent discussions in Washington between representatives of the Republic of Korea and of the United States on economic subjects, the Republic of Korea has reaffirmed its decision to maintain the rate of exchange between the Korean hwan and the United States dollar at 500 hwan to one United States dollar. The 500-to-1 rate, which has been in effect since August 15, 1955, is applicable to all foreign exchange transactions of the Republic of Korea. The two Governments will observe closely economic developments in Korea and will continue to consult on measures that may be necessary to achieve greater economic stability.

United States Sends Food Grains to Drought Area in Peru

The International Cooperation Administration announced on January 14 that the United States will send approximately 40,000 tons of food grains to Peru to help relieve critical food shortages resulting from 2 years of continuing drought.

Some 1.8 million people—most of them subsistence farmers—live in the drought-affected area of

southern Peru. It is estimated that their crop losses during the 1955-56 crop year averaged nearly 75 percent of normal yields. Lack of pasturage also has led to distress slaughter of livestock, and it is estimated that about two-thirds of the area's livestock may be lost.

The food grains, valued at \$4.5 million, based on Commodity Credit Corporation costs, will be made available under title II of Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, which authorizes ICA to grant U.S. agricultural commodities to friendly peoples for emergency or relief purposes.

ICA also is authorizing the use of up to \$900,000 from title II funds to pay ocean freight costs for transporting the foodstuffs to Peru. The Government of Peru will pay all inland transportation and distribution costs.

From the ports of Mollendo and Matarani, the food grains will be moved by rail, truck, burro, and llama over about 375 miles of some of the roughest mountain terrain in the world. Peru's problems are further complicated by the fact that the communities where these grains are needed are in a subsistence farming area with a primitive barter economy where there are no established commercial outlets capable of handling such a large volume of foodstuffs.

In May 1956, 45,000 tons of wheat, barley, and corn and 2,000 tons of dry milk were made available to Peru, also under title II, when drought and unusually early frosts in the same area created serious food shortages. The Government of Peru is devoting the proceeds from last year's sales to public works projects in the drought area to provide work for the large numbers of people who have left the farms, and will use local currencies to be generated from the current program in the same manner. Additional food distribution also is being carried out through Peru's rural schools.

These emergency food relief programs supplement the regular technical cooperation program through which the United States and Peru are working together in agriculture, health, education, and rural-development projects. For the current fiscal year, \$2.8 million has been programmed for U.S. contributions toward these projects. It is estimated that the Peruvian Government will contribute the equivalent of about \$6.4 million during the same period.

Disappearance of U.S. Pilot in Dominican Republic

Press release 37 dated January 25

Gerald Lester Murphy, a 23-year-old airplane pilot and a native of Eugene, Oreg., left his apartment in Ciudad Trujillo on December 3, 1956, and has not been seen again.

Immediately upon learning of his disappearance, the American Embassy in Ciudad Trujillo communicated with the Dominican Government and sought its cooperation in ascertaining Murphy's whereabouts. It has since continued its efforts to obtain from the Dominican authorities all available information relating to Murphy and the circumstances surrounding his disappearance, as well as to pursue its own inquiries through such means as are available to it.

It is understood that, from some time in February until late November 1956, Murphy was employed as a copilot for the *Compania Dominicana de Aviacion*. According to the Department's information, following Murphy's employment by the Dominican airline (CDA) certain dissatisfaction arose among some of the CDA pilots. Particularly, a Dominican citizen named Octavio de la Maza was reported to have been especially resentful of Murphy's presence in CDA. Dominican authorities, informed of this report by our Embassy, took De la Maza into custody for questioning on December 17, 1956.

On January 7 the American Chargé d'Affaires was informed that De la Maza had hanged himself in his cell at 4 a.m. that morning. The chargé was shown a suicide note alleged to have been written by De la Maza, in which he said he had met Murphy the evening of December 3, that they had gone to the site near the sea where Murphy's automobile was later found, that during an exchange of blows Murphy had fallen into the sea, and that De la Maza had decided to kill himself out of remorse.

By a communication dated December 31, 1956, the Embassy formally requested of the Dominican Government a written report on its police search for Murphy. On January 16, 1957, the

Dominican Government was similarly requested to provide the fullest possible report on the activities of Murphy in the Dominican Republic prior to his disappearance.

As of this date, the Department is still awaiting the reports requested of the Dominican authorities. Meanwhile, investigations aimed at clarifying Murphy's disappearance are being pursued vigorously.

Defense Agreement Negotiations With Portugal Postponed

Press release 34 dated January 23

Owing to the illness of the Portuguese Foreign Minister,¹ the Portuguese-American negotiations in connection with the defense agreement of 1951 have been temporarily postponed.

In the meantime all facilities granted under the 1951 agreement continue to be made available, and it is hoped that the negotiations can be resumed before long.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

84th Congress, 2d Session

The Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724, 79th Congress) as amended to December 1, 1956. December 18, 1956. 119 pp. [Committee print.]

Safety of Life at Sea Study. Report pursuant to H. Res. 653 (84th Congress). H. Rept. 2969, January 3, 1957. 13 pp.

85th Congress, 1st Session

The State of the Union. Address of the President delivered before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives relative to the state of the Union. H. Doc. 1, January 10, 1957. 9 pp.

Fifth Semiannual Report on Activities Carried on Under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as Amended, Outlining Operations Under the Act During the Period July 1 Through December 31, 1956. H. Doc. 50, January 14, 1957. 24 pp.

Study of Foreign Aid Program. Report to accompany S. Res. 35. S. Rept. 2, January 14, 1957. 4 pp.

¹ For an announcement of the official visit to Washington of the Portuguese Foreign Minister, Dr. Paulo Cunha, in November 1955, see BULLETIN of Dec. 12, 1955, p. 966.

The International Economic Situation

EXCERPTS FROM THE ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

The following three excerpts are from chapter 2 ("Economic Growth and Improvement, 1953-56"), chapter 3 ("Economic Developments in 1956"), and chapter 4 ("Extending and Broadening Economic Progress") of the Economic Report of the President.¹

GROWTH OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

The period [1953-56] has also been one of improvement in the economies of other nations of the free world. Vigorous economic growth has characterized the industrialized countries of Western Europe and also Canada and Japan. In each of these, the flow of goods and services to consumers and the additions made to productive plant and equipment have increased materially. Substantial progress has also been made in many of the nations that are economically less developed, although the rate of growth has varied widely among them.

A remarkable strengthening of international trade and finance has taken place. Trade among the nations of the free world rose from less than \$74 billion in 1952 to approximately \$93 billion in 1956. Responding to economic expansion at home and abroad and to the gradual relaxation of trade controls, our foreign trade and investment have increased markedly; both exports and imports were at record levels in 1956. Following a decline for a short time after the termination of the Korean conflict, nonmilitary exports of goods and

services increased during 1954, thus helping to sustain business activity in this country. The expansion of these exports was extended in 1955 and 1956, in the latter year reaching about \$23 billion, approximately 28 percent more than in 1952. Imports of goods and services followed the trend of domestic business activity more closely, falling in 1954 and rising in the next two years. In 1956, they totaled almost \$20 billion, some 25 percent above their total four years earlier.

Although Government grants and credits still financed a sizable amount of our exports, increasing reliance was placed on private trade and investment during the past four years. Net private investment abroad of United States funds was at a new high in 1956. While expanding their purchases of goods and services from the United States, other countries have added about \$7 billion to their gold and dollar reserves since 1952. The increase in these reserves, which were severely depleted during and after World War II, is traceable largely to our imports of goods and services and to our military expenditures abroad. Further expansion of nonmilitary exports will continue to depend, fundamentally, upon the volume of our imports and the amount of private United States investment in foreign countries.

The sharpest expansion in our exports has been in shipments to industrialized countries with high per capita incomes, which are often competitive with us, and to certain less developed countries in which the rate of economic expansion has recently been high. This fact strongly suggests the economic advantage to this country which can accrue from economic development abroad. When trade is conducted on a nondiscriminatory, multilateral basis, it is natural to expect that

¹ H. Doc. 29, 85th Cong., 1st sess.; transmitted to the Congress on Jan. 23; for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. (65 cents).

prosperity elsewhere will be reflected in an increased demand for the products of our farms, mines, and factories. Such has been the case in the last four years.

THE PATTERN OF THE EXPANSION

Growing foreign trade and investment was another expansionary factor. Merchandise shipments abroad (excluding military aid transfers), which comprised approximately three-fourths of our exports of goods and services, were nearly \$3 billion greater than in 1955 and at a record high of \$17 billion (Table 3). Almost three-fourths of these shipments consisted of manufactured industrial goods, mostly finished goods. Export activity was especially marked for a number of industries confronted by heavy domestic demands; machinery exports rose about 24 percent and with iron and steel products and chemicals accounted for about one-third of the \$3 billion increase. Expansion of bituminous coal exports provided an important additional market for that industry.

Merchandise shipped to this country, which comprised almost two-thirds of our imports of goods and services, rose more than \$1 billion, to a new

TABLE 3.—United States exports and imports of goods and services, 1952–56

Excluding transfers under military grant programs

(Billions of dollars)

Year	Exports			Imports			Export surplus of goods and services ³
	Total	Goods	Serv-ices ¹	Total	Goods	Serv-ices ²	
1952----	18.1	13.3	4.7	15.7	10.8	4.9	2.4
1953----	17.1	12.3	4.8	16.6	11.0	5.7	.4
1954----	17.9	12.8	5.1	16.1	10.4	5.7	1.8
1955----	19.9	14.3	5.7	17.9	11.5	6.4	2.0
1956 ³ ---	23.1	17.0	6.1	19.7	12.7	7.0	3.4

¹ Includes income on investments.

² Includes income on investments and United States military expenditures abroad.

³ Preliminary estimates by Council of Economic Advisers.

NOTE.—Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Department of Commerce (except as noted).

high of nearly \$13 billion. Half of our merchandise imports consisted of finished and semimanufactured industrial goods. Larger inflows of such items as structural steel, machinery, nonferrous metals and ferroalloys, and iron ore and concen-

trates reflected the high level of our industrial activity. Notable increases also occurred in imports of automobiles, paper, cotton and woolen textiles, and, prior to the blocking of the Suez Canal, crude petroleum.

The excess of exports over imports was made possible in part by greater private capital investments abroad. These investments, which were almost \$1.2 billion in 1955, more than doubled in 1956. Most of the increase consisted of investments in foreign branches and subsidiaries of United States corporations in Canada, Western Europe, and Latin America. The volume of sales of Canadian securities to United States investors was larger than in 1955. United States Government loans to foreign countries, and investments of foreigners in the United States, also increased. The net result of all these transactions, with private remittances and nonmilitary Government grants virtually unchanged, was an addition of almost \$2 billion of net foreign investment to gross national product.

STRENGTHENING ECONOMIC TIES WITH OTHER COUNTRIES

A major objective of United States foreign economic policy continues to be to facilitate and increase the international flow of goods and capital on a nondiscriminatory basis. Since the volume of our imports and the amount of private funds available for investment abroad depend mainly on domestic prosperity, a stable and growing economy at home is an essential foundation for a sound structure of world trade. But positive measures are needed to help other nations participate in the growth and prosperity of the free world. Considerable progress has been made in this direction in the last four years, but important opportunities remain.

By multilateral reductions of trade barriers, the United States has promoted the nondiscriminatory flow of goods, while reserving the right to prevent serious injury to domestic industries. The authority initially granted by the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was extended until June 30, 1958, with some modifications, by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. The 1955 legislation provided the President with certain new authority. Specifically, it permitted the

reduction of tariffs on a reciprocal basis by as much as 5 percent a year for three years, and made possible the reduction, in annual stages, of rates in excess of 50 percent ad valorem to the 50 percent level. In accordance with this legislation, reciprocal tariff concessions involving approximately \$1 billion of United States exports and imports were negotiated with 21 foreign countries in 1956 under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). In 1955, prior to the passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, the United States and 16 other countries concluded substantial tariff negotiations with Japan under the GATT, thereby bringing that country economically closer to the rest of the free world. The "escape clause" and "peril point" provisions of the Trade Agreements Act, which are designed to protect domestic industries against serious injury from tariff concessions, continue to serve as safeguards for domestic enterprise in a manner broadly consistent with trade liberalization.

Multilateral negotiations under the GATT have been more effective than bilateral negotiations in reducing trade barriers and discriminatory restrictions against our exports. To make the GATT an even more effective instrument for removing discrimination against our exports, an administrative agency—the Organization for Trade Cooperation—is required. In order to enhance the advantages that the GATT now provides, Congress is requested to enact legislation authorizing United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

The United States has provided large sums to assist the economic development of other countries through Government grants and loans and private investment. The last three Economic Reports have emphasized the desirability of encouraging private investment in countries seeking to expedite their development. Private investment is generally accompanied by technical and managerial services that are as necessary as capital funds but are often more difficult to obtain. At present, foreign tax inducements to attract capital are in some situations nullified by not allowing credit in determining United States tax liability for income taxes waived by the country in which the investment is made. The investment of private funds abroad would be facilitated by tax treaties which, subject to appropriate safeguards, recognize the laws of other countries designed to attract new investment.

The economic development of the free world has been materially aided by grants and loans extended by our Government. For the current fiscal year, \$1.8 billion was appropriated for nonmilitary assistance under the Mutual Security Program, including defense support, development assistance, technical cooperation, and other programs. Recommendations will be presented to the Congress to continue this assistance and to provide the flexibility needed to help meet the challenge of rapidly changing international conditions.

The Export-Import Bank has loaned substantial amounts to finance our exports and to assist economic development abroad. Private capital has been associated with many of these loans, thus augmenting the effectiveness of the Bank's operations. The authority of the Export-Import Bank to approve credits, which expires June 30, 1958, should be extended.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund, which rely in large part on the capital subscriptions and guarantees of the United States Government, increased their dollar transactions markedly in 1956. The lending activities of the Bank aid in the sound economic development of its member countries. The International Monetary Fund helps member countries meet temporary maladjustments in their balance of payments positions and promotes sound international financial policies and freer foreign exchange transactions. Recently, it provided funds to strengthen the reserve position of the United Kingdom.²

United States customs procedures were simplified and inequities removed by legislation enacted in 1953 and 1956. In accordance with the 1953 law, a series of administrative actions has liberalized import invoice requirements. The Customs Simplification Act of 1956 is intended to reduce burdensome delays and uncertainties by modifying the methods employed in the customs valuation of imported merchandise. On the basis of other legislation, the Tariff Commission is investigating ways to improve the present system of commodity classification and the customs rate structure.

Two promising moves now under study would further the economic integration of Western Europe. One is the establishment of a common

² BULLETIN of Jan. 7, 1957, p. 28.

market, without internal trade barriers, among the six continental nations comprising the European Coal and Steel Community. The second is the association of the United Kingdom with these countries and other continental nations in a free trade area. These moves, if brought to a constructive conclusion, should add much to the growing economic strength and political unification of the area, with substantial benefits to the United States and the entire free world.

The continued industrialization of Western

Europe and of much of the rest of the world requires the expansion of economical sources of energy. Members of the European Steel and Coal Community are planning cooperative efforts in the field of atomic energy. Action should be taken by the Congress to authorize full participation by the United States in the work of the International Atomic Energy Agency of the United Nations, in order to extend our program of helping free-world nations share in the benefits of peaceful use of the atom.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

General Assembly Consideration of the Problem of Disarmament

Following are the texts of statements made in Committee I (Political and Security) on January 14 and 25 by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., U.S. Representative to the General Assembly, during debate on disarmament; a resolution, cosponsored by the United States, which the Committee adopted unanimously on January 25; and a memorandum, circulated on January 12, containing new U.S. proposals on disarmament.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, JANUARY 14

U. S. delegation press release 2586

The report of the Disarmament Commission,¹ including the proceedings of its Subcommittee, is before us. Now is the time to review that work.

My statement today, however, will look more to the future than to the past. It deals with the steps and means by which a sound and safeguarded agreement might be reached in the new year just beginning.

The President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, will soon begin a new administration in the Government of our country. He has been elected for a second term by the people and will

be inaugurated for that 4-year period. The members of the United Nations may be confident of his continued devotion to the quest for a just and durable peace. He continues to lead our Nation in a renewed effort to find the way to devote more of the resources of mankind to abundant peace and less to armaments and armed forces; to reduce tensions and increase confidence among nations by establishing a reliably inspected and lower level of armaments; and to lessen the perils of the outbreak of war by easing the dangers of great surprise attack.

Only recently, in his letter to Marshal Bulganin of December 31, 1956,² President Eisenhower reaffirmed his belief that "deliberations within the framework of the United Nations seem most likely to produce a step forward in the highly complicated matter of disarmament."

President Eisenhower also declared the intention of the United States to submit new proposals in the United Nations.

These new proposals will center upon five principal points. Before outlining these points, I wish to emphasize that the United States is ready and willing to take sound steps toward arms reduc-

¹ U.N. doc. A/3470.

² BULLETIN of Jan. 21, 1957, p. 89.

tions, whether they are very small or whether they are large and extensive, provided, however, that any such step must be subject to effective inspection. This insistence on adequate inspection is not a whim. It arises from the deep conviction after a thorough study that only an inspected agreement would serve the objective of a reliable peace.

An agreement without effective inspection would immediately become the source of doubts and suspicions, of distrust and invective, and of charges and countercharges. Such an unsound agreement would add to tensions and increase the danger of war.

Deeply as we are convinced of the desirability of a reliable agreement and of the dangers in the absence of agreement, we have nonetheless concluded that a bad agreement is worse for the cause of peace than no agreement. An uninspected agreement, or an inadequately controlled agreement, or a one-sided agreement would be a bad agreement. It would not serve the objective of peace.

We believe that renewed negotiations should strive toward these objectives:

1. To reverse the trend toward larger stockpiles of nuclear weapons and to reduce the future nuclear threat.
2. To provide against great surprise attack and thus reduce the danger of major war.
3. To lessen the burden of armaments and to make possible improved standards of living.
4. To insure that research and development activities concerning the propulsion of objects through outer space be devoted exclusively to scientific and peaceful purposes.
5. To ease tensions and to facilitate settlement of difficult political issues.

To meet these objectives, the United States makes the following proposals in broad outline. Specific details will, of course, be developed in the negotiations in the subcommittee.

First: The United States proposes that an agreement be reached under which at an early date, under effective international inspection, all future production of fissionable materials shall be used or stockpiled exclusively for nonweapons purposes under international supervision. The members of the Assembly and scientists throughout the world know that it is impossible to account with essential certainty, or to discover through

any known scientific means of inspection, all of the fissionable materials produced in the past or all of the existing accumulation of nuclear weapons. It is not possible to turn backward the clock of nuclear discovery and development, nor to repeal the nuclear age. One thing which can be done and which, for the sake of humanity, the United States proposes should be done is to establish effective international control of future production of fissionable materials and to exchange firm commitments to use all future production exclusively for nonweapons purposes.

When such commitments are executed, it would then be possible to move reliably toward the reduction of existing stockpiles. When future production is controlled, it should be easier than it is with the information now available to establish within a reasonable range of accuracy the approximate amount of fissionable materials previously produced, so that equitable and proportionate amounts in successive increments could be transferred from past production to internationally supervised national or international use for nonweapons purposes.

The members of this Assembly will recognize that this proposal is the logical projection and followthrough of the concept emphasized by President Eisenhower in his message to this body on December 8, 1953, when he proposed the atoms-for-peace program. It is inspired by the same motives which led to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency through the cooperation of nations of the world.

Under this program the United States, for its part, would make generous, progressive transfers of fissionable material to peaceful uses, just as it has previously announced its intention to contribute to the International Atomic Energy Agency. It will continue to encourage nations to make their full contributions to the constructive uses of atomic energy.

Under such a program, the whole future may be changed. The course of atomic development will move in a benign direction rather than toward some evil end.

Second: If such an arrangement to control the future production of fissionable material can be negotiated and put into effect, it would then be possible, in a secure manner, to limit and ultimately to eliminate all nuclear test explosions. The United States proposes that this be done.

Pending the negotiation of such an agreement, the United States is also willing to work out promptly methods for advance notice and registration of all nuclear tests, as has been suggested by the delegation of Norway, and to provide for limited international observation of such tests. This could be an effective forerunner of far-reaching agreement, affecting both the nuclear threat itself and testing in particular.

Third: The United States proposes that we move ahead toward the realization of a first-stage reduction, under adequate inspection, of conventional armaments and armed forces, using as a basis of measurement the figures of 2.5 million for the Soviet Union and the United States, and 750,000 for France and the United Kingdom, upon which the countries represented on the Subcommittee seem to agree. The United States proposes that we achieve this forward step through the progressive establishment of an effective inspection system concurrent with such reductions. An effective inspection system would require an appropriate aerial inspection component as well as ground units. The United States accepts the principle of establishing observers at key ground locations, as generally proposed by Marshal Bulganin, in addition to air inspection. The proposed first stage of reduction can be fulfilled provided there is good faith on all sides in establishing a system of inspection that can in fact verify the commitments.

It would seem appropriate, also, for other nations to begin to consider the relation between their own armed forces and the projected first-stage force levels, in the event the fulfillment of such first-stage reductions can be assured in the coming negotiations of the Subcommittee.

The United States does not believe that deeper reductions than those agreed for the first stage can be made unless some progress is made in settlement of the major political issues now dividing the world. But the fulfillment of a first-stage reduction would certainly improve the climate for the negotiation of such political settlements.

Fourth: Scientists in many nations are now proceeding with efforts to propel objects through outer space and to travel in the distant areas beyond the earth's atmospheric envelope. The scope of these experiments is variously indicated in the terms "earth satellites," "intercontinental missiles," "long-range unmanned weapons," and

"space platforms." No one can now predict with certainty what will develop from man's excursion in this new field. But it is clear that, if this advance into the unknown is to be a blessing rather than a curse, the efforts of all nations in this field need to be brought within the purview of a reliable armaments-control system. The United States proposes that the first step toward the objective of assuring that future developments in outer space would be devoted exclusively to peaceful and scientific purposes would be to bring the testing of such objects under international inspection and participation. The United States earth satellite presently planned for the International Geophysical Year is an example of an open project devoted exclusively to scientific purposes and developed with the knowledge and approbation of the scientists of the nations represented in the International Geophysical Year.³ In this matter, as in other matters, we are ready to participate in fair, balanced, reliable systems of control.

Fifth: The United States continues to emphasize the importance of providing against the possibility of great surprise attack. This is not a minor or an ancillary proposal. The nature of modern weapons is such that, if all nations are safeguarded against great surprise attack, there is much less likelihood that a calculated major war would be initiated in the nuclear age. Likewise, such mutual assurances against great surprise attack would do much to prevent miscalculation by any nation regarding the intention of another. The greater the speed of potential attack and the more devastating the blows that could be struck, the greater is the danger that anxious apprehension, feeding on ignorance of the dispositions and intentions of others, would adversely and dangerously affect the decisions of nations.

It is in the interest of each nation not only that it have sure knowledge that other nations are not preparing a great surprise attack upon it but also that these other nations should have sure knowledge that it is not planning a great surprise attack upon them. Today many nations have knowledge of the location of key centers, of the areas of strategic importance, and of the concentration of military power of other nations. This information would be adequate for the waging

³ For background, see *ibid.*, Aug. 13, 1956, p. 280, and Dec. 3, 1956, p. 880.

of a devastating war. But unless a reliable inspection system is established with open skies, open ports, open centers, each nation will possess something less than the regular, dependable information necessary to form a stable basis for a durable peace. The United States proposes therefore the progressive installation of inspection systems which will provide against the possibility of great surprise attack. The United States is willing to execute, either as an opening step or a later step, the complete proposal made in the summit conference at Geneva by President Eisenhower.⁴

It is clear that, whatever the first steps may be, a method of control, an organization of supervision, and a mechanism for regulation will be needed. The United States proposes that such an international agency for the regulation of armaments should be installed concurrently with the beginning of the program. It can constitute a nucleus of hope at the center of the grim implications which radiate from the destructive power of modern armament.

In making these new proposals may I reemphasize that the United States continues to stand back of the proposals and suggestions made by it at the summit conference at Geneva and in the meetings of the Subcommittee since that time.

You will find in the Subcommittee report suggestions submitted by the United States at London in May 1956 for initial steps for demonstration of inspection methods, for joint technical study, and for first levels of reduced armaments. I will not burden you with a review in detail. The record is before you. We stand on this record, and we present our new proposals in a spirit of endeavor to meet the views of other nations. We are trying to move toward agreement, provided only that such agreement is sound and secure.

We are fully aware of the extent of devastation which would befall mankind if a third world war should occur. We believe it to be in the interest of all nations to take far-reaching steps to minimize this danger. We are convinced that an armaments-control agreement which is fair to both sides and thoroughly inspected so that there can be no reasonable doubt of its fulfillment is both physically and theoretically possible. Such an accord should be politically attainable if the prompt, forthright, and thoughtful attention of

the governments of the world is given to this problem.

That is the spirit in which I speak on behalf of the United States today.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE, JANUARY 25

U.S. delegation press release 2600

The pending resolution is cosponsored by 12 nations of diverse points of view. All of the members of the Subcommittee of the Disarmament Commission are among the cosponsors. It is a product of the conciliation and spirit of compromise which, we hope, will accompany our future efforts. It is deliberately noncontroversial. It refers a number of past and more recent proposals to the Disarmament Commission and its Subcommittee for study. We believe that these bodies, expressly created for this purpose, are the best place to continue the detailed and technical discussions which are necessary.

We believe that unanimous adoption of the resolution which we have cosponsored will help to set the stage for successful negotiations. We believe also, Mr. Chairman, that in the negotiations to come there is no substitute for hard work, for mutual good will, and for patience. The unfortunate fact that 10 years of discussion have not produced an agreement must not deter us. We must continue to seek new ways to reach an agreement.

We believe that progress has been made in the past years; even though the progress has not been as much as we would like, we welcome it, such as it is.

We think that the proposals which the United States presented to this Committee on January 14 can serve as a sound basis for progress. The United States will continue its search for even modest steps which can be agreed on and which will help us reverse the trend toward greater and greater stockpiles of armaments. We hope in this search to make plain to the world our perseverance and our realism.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment briefly on four proposals which have been made during the course of this debate. Two proposals are on the question of nuclear testing. The two resolutions which are before us, documents A/C.1/L.160 and A/C.1/L.162, will be referred to the Disarma-

⁴ *Ibid.*, Aug. 1, 1955, p. 173.

ment Commission and its Subcommittee for consideration.

Let me explain again the position of the United States on the issues involved in these proposals.

The Soviet resolution, A/C.1/L.160, calls for immediate and unconditional prohibition of nuclear-weapons testing. Our position on this general matter has been put forward clearly in this Committee. In short, the United States favors the limitation and ultimate elimination of nuclear-weapons testing as part of a safeguarded system of disarmament. We oppose any prohibition of weapons testing which does not at the same time strike at the heart of the problem, and that is the continued production of nuclear weapons themselves.

The United States is prepared to give its full endorsement to the proposal put forth by Canada, Japan, and Norway in document A/C.1/L.162, which is also being referred to the Disarmament Commission for consideration. Although this proposal is only a preliminary step, we find it to be both realistic and constructive. We will give this suggestion our support in the Subcommittee, and we hope that it will be put into effect at an early date. The United States is ready to participate in any registration system agreed upon among the states concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the contribution of Japan in this field makes it particularly painful for us to learn that a dispatch brings the news of the death today of former Foreign Minister Mamoru Shigemitsu of Japan. Only a few weeks ago he was here among us as Foreign Minister to be present as Japan entered the United Nations. It was dramatic and very moving for us, who remembered his dignified and significant part in the ending of hostilities almost 12 years ago, to see him standing outside of the Delegates' Entrance, raising his hand as his country's flag was hoisted at the United Nations. Let me express to my friend, Ambassador Renzo Sawada, our personal expressions of sympathy to Foreign Minister Shigemitsu's family and the official condolences of the United States on the passing of a patriot and a statesman.

Mr. Chairman, the next matter raised by several delegations relates to a special session of the General Assembly to consider the question of disarmament. In this connection we can look with profit upon the experience which we gained as a

result of the successful negotiations leading to the adoption of the statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. When agreement among a number of the principal nations involved in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy was achieved, a general conference of states proved to be both proper and highly useful.

The United States has long held that, after agreement among the major armed powers was achieved, the subject of disarmament should be considered by a general conference with wide international participation. We think that it would be premature to decide upon the convening of such a conference or a special session of the General Assembly now.

The progress which has been made so far in disarmament unfortunately does not justify our doing so. But we are willing to have the Disarmament Commission consider the advisability of recommending the convening of either a special session of the General Assembly or a general disarmament conference at an appropriate time. Our present conviction is that such a conference would serve no purpose now. It might, indeed, simply increase the difficulties we face. The convening of such a conference should await the time when a large measure of agreement among those states whose participation is essential to any effective disarmament agreement is achieved.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there is the issue of expansion of the membership of the Disarmament Commission and its Subcommittee. Document A/C.1/L.164 deals with this question. We believe that any changes in the membership of the Disarmament Commission should correspond to and be conditional upon changes resulting from the proposed enlargement of the Security Council.

Please note that the participation of other states in the consideration of disarmament is assured in two ways: first, in the debates of the General Assembly; secondly, in the Disarmament Commission, which often hears representatives of states which are not Commission members.

With regard to the proposal for enlargement of the Subcommittee, we believe that this would be an unfortunate departure from the sound principle that agreement in the first instance must be achieved among the major armed powers. We are convinced that efforts to achieve initial agreement in the larger group would only complicate the problem and make negotiations more difficult.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION ⁵

U.N. doc. A/C.1/785

The General Assembly,

1. *Recalling* its resolution 808 (IX) of 4 November 1954,
2. *Recognizing* that the achievement of an agreement on the problem of disarmament would contribute to the strengthening of international peace and security,

3. *Welcoming* the progress made on certain aspects of the disarmament problem by the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee since the tenth General Assembly,

4. *Requests* the Disarmament Commission to reconvene its Sub-Committee at an early date;

5. *Recommends* that the Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee give prompt attention to the various proposals that have been submitted to the United Nations including the proposal of the Governments of Canada, Japan and Norway of 18 January 1957;⁶ the Anglo-French comprehensive proposals of 11 June 1954, 19 March 1956 and 3 May 1956; the proposals of the United States made under date of 14 January 1957; the proposals of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics made under date of 10 May 1955, 27 March 1956, 12 July 1956, 17 November 1956,⁷ 14 January 1957⁸ and 24 January 1957;⁹ the proposals of the Government of India made under date of 25 July 1956; and the proposals of the Government of Yugoslavia of 10 July 1956; and give continued consideration to the plan of Mr. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, for exchanging military blueprints and mutual aerial inspection, and the plan of Mr. Bulganin, Prime Minister of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, for establishing control posts at strategic centres;

6. *Recommends further* that the Disarmament Commission request its Sub-Committee to prepare a progress report for consideration by the Commission not later than 1 August 1957;

7. *Transmits* to the Disarmament Commission the records of the meetings of the First Committee at which the problem of disarmament was discussed with the request that the Commission and its Sub-Committee give careful and early consideration to the views expressed in those documents;

8. *Invites* the Disarmament Commission to consider the advisability of recommending that a special session of the General Assembly or a general disarmament conference be convened at the appropriate time.

TEXT OF U.S. MEMORANDUM

U.N. doc. A/C.1/783 dated January 12

The United States makes the following proposals, in

⁵ Sponsored by Australia, Brazil, Canada, El Salvador, France, India, Japan, Norway, U.S.S.R., U.K., U.S., and Yugoslavia; adopted by Committee I on Jan. 25 by a vote of 77-0, with no abstentions.

⁶ U.N. doc. A/C.1/L.162.

⁷ BULLETIN of Jan. 21, 1957, p. 89.

⁸ U.N. doc. A/C.1/L.161.

⁹ U.N. doc. A/C.1/L.164.

broad outline. Specific details will, of course, be developed in the negotiations in the Subcommittee.

First: The United States proposes that an agreement be reached under which at an early date under effective international inspection, all future production of fissionable materials shall be used or stockpiled exclusively for non-weapons purposes under international supervision. The members of the Assembly and scientists throughout the world know that it is impossible to account with essential certainty, or to discover through any known scientific means of inspection, all of the fissionable materials produced in the past, or all of the existing accumulation of nuclear weapons. It is not possible to turn backward the clock of nuclear discovery and development, nor to repeal the Nuclear Age. One thing which can be done and which, for the sake of humanity, the United States proposes should be done, is to establish effective international control of future production of fissionable materials and to exchange firm commitments to use all future production exclusively for non-weapons purposes.

When such commitments are executed, it would then be possible to move reliably toward the reduction of existing stockpiles. When future production is controlled it should be easier than with information now available to establish, within a reasonable range of accuracy, the approximate amount of fissionable materials previously produced, so that equitable and proportionate transfers in successive increments could be made from past production over to the internationally supervised national or international non-weapons use of such material.

The members of this Assembly will recognize that this proposal is the logical projection and follow-through of the concept emphasized by President Eisenhower in his message to this body on 8 December 1953 when he proposed the "Atoms-for-Peace" programme. It is inspired by the same motives which led to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency through the co-operation of nations of the world.

Under this programme the United States, for its part, would make generous, progressive transfers of fissionable material to peaceful uses, just as it has previously announced its intention to contribute to the International Atomic Energy Agency. It will continue to encourage nations to make their full contributions to the constructive uses of atomic energy.

Under such a programme, the whole future trend may be changed. The course of atomic development will move in a benign direction rather than toward some evil end.

Second: If such an arrangement to control the future production of fissionable material can be negotiated and put into effect it would then be possible, in a secure manner, to limit, and ultimately to eliminate, all nuclear test explosions. The United States proposes that this be done. Pending the negotiation of such an agreement, the United States is also willing to work out promptly methods for advance notice and registration of all nuclear tests and to provide for limited international observation of such tests. This could be an effective forerunner of far-reaching agreement affecting both the nuclear threat itself and testing, in particular.

Third: The United States proposes that we move ahead

toward the realization of a first stage reduction, under adequate inspection, of conventional armaments and armed forces, using as a basis of measurement the figures of 2.5 million for the USSR and the United States, and 750,000 for France and the United Kingdom, upon which the countries represented on the Subcommittee seem to agree. The United States proposes that we achieve this forward step through the progressive establishment of an effective inspection system concurrent with such reductions. An effective inspection system would require an appropriate aerial inspection component as well as ground units. The United States accepts the principle of establishing observers at key ground locations, as generally proposed by Chairman Bulganin, in addition to air inspection. The proposed first stage of reductions can be fulfilled provided there is good faith on all sides in establishing a system of inspection that can in fact verify the commitments.

It would seem appropriate, also, for other nations to begin to consider the relation between their own armed forces and the projected first stage force levels, in the event the fulfillment of such first stage reductions can be assured in the coming negotiations of the Subcommittee.

The United States does not believe that deeper reductions than these agreed for the first stage can be made unless some progress is made in settlement of the major political issues now dividing the world. But the fulfillment of a first stage reduction would certainly improve the climate for the negotiation of such political settlements.

Fourth: Scientists in many nations are now proceeding with efforts to propel objects through outer space and to travel in the distant areas beyond the earth's atmospheric envelope. The scope of these programmes is variously indicated in the terms: "earth satellites", "intercontinental missiles", "long-range unmanned weapons" and "space platforms". No one can now predict with certainty what will develop from man's excursion in this new field. But it is clear that if this advance into the unknown is to be a blessing rather than a curse the efforts of all nations in this field need to be brought within the purview of a reliable armaments control system. The United States proposes that the first step toward the objective of assuring that future developments in outer space would be devoted exclusively to peaceful and scientific purposes would be to bring the testing of such objects under international inspection and participation. In this matter, as in other matters, we are ready to participate in fair, balanced, reliable systems of control.

Fifth: The United States continues to emphasize the importance of providing against the possibility of great surprise attack. This is not a minor or peripheral proposal. The nature of modern weapons is such that if all nations are safeguarded against great surprise attack there is much less likelihood that a calculated major war would be initiated in the nuclear age. Likewise, such mutual assurances against great surprise attack would do much to prevent miscalculation by any nation regarding the intention of another. The greater the speed of potential attack and the more devastating the blows that could be struck the greater is the danger that anxious

apprehension, feeding on ignorance of the dispositions and intentions of others, would adversely and dangerously affect the decisions of nations.

It is in the interest of each nation, not only that it have sure knowledge that other nations are not preparing a great surprise attack upon it, but, also, that these other nations should have sure knowledge that it is not planning a great surprise attack upon them. Today many nations have knowledge of the location of key centres, of the areas of strategic importance, and of the concentration of military power of other nations. This information would be adequate for the waging of a devastating war. But unless a reliable inspection system is established with open skies, open ports, open centres, each nation will possess something less than the regular, dependable information necessary to form a stable basis for a durable peace. The United States proposes, therefore, the progressive installation of inspection systems which will provide against the possibility of great surprise attack. The United States is willing to execute, either as an opening step or a later step, the complete proposal made in the Summit Conference at Geneva by President Eisenhower.

It is clear that whatever the first steps may be, a method of control, an organization of supervision, and a mechanism for regulation will be needed. The United States proposes that such an international agency for the regulation of armaments should be installed concurrently with the beginning of the programme. It can constitute a nucleus of hope at the centre of the grim implications which radiate from the destructive power of modern armament.

In making these new proposals the United States continues to stand back of the proposals and suggestions made by it at the Summit Conference at Geneva and in the meetings of the Subcommittee since that time.

Security Council To Continue Consideration of Kashmir Dispute

**STATEMENT BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE U.N.¹**

In considering the India-Pakistan item, the Security Council faces an unfortunate difference of opinion between two nations whose friendship and esteem is highly valued by the United States. We desire to help them to find a solution to this problem, and we approach the question in that spirit.

It is regrettable that this dispute has lasted more than 9 years despite the earnest efforts of the Security Council and of its representatives,

¹ Made in the Security Council on Jan. 24 (U.S./U.N. press release 2598).

the individual efforts of certain members of the Council, and the attempts of the parties concerned.

It is a tribute to the Council and to the parties that a cease-fire was achieved on January 1, 1949, as part of an agreement by India and Pakistan for demilitarization and for a United Nations-sponsored plebiscite. Unfortunately, however, and despite the best efforts of the Council and its representatives, the parties have failed to agree on carrying out the next two steps.

It is understandable that strong emotions should be involved on both sides of this problem. One of the first concerns of the Council has always been that nothing should be done which might aggravate the situation. This was made clear and explicit in the Council's first resolution on the case, adopted on January 17, 1948. We trust that both parties will do their utmost to continue to approach this question with restraint and that they will take such measures as are within their power to assure the maintenance of a peaceful atmosphere.

We appreciate the fact that the Representative of India [V. K. Krishna Menon] changed the arrangement of his presentation so as to deal with the Constituent Assembly yesterday afternoon in order to suit the convenience of the Council. It is to this point alone that I now refer and to which the draft resolution is addressed. With respect to the substance of the broad issue, we are studying the remarks both of the Representative of India and of Pakistan carefully, and we will express ourselves on the issue at the proper time.

The Council will recall that on March 30, 1951, it took note of the proposed convening of a Constituent Assembly in Kashmir and affirmed that any action that the Assembly might take to determine the future affiliation of the state would not constitute a disposition of the state in conformity with the agreed principle relating to a free and impartial plebiscite.

The resolution we consider today is basically a reaffirmation of that statement by the Council. It has been occasioned by a complaint that the Assembly, referred to in the March 1951 resolution, has not only convened but has drawn up and promulgated a constitution and that this constitution does, among other things, relate to the affiliation of the state to India.

Differing interpretations have been put on the

meaning and effect of this and other actions relating to the connection between Kashmir and India, extending back to the accession instrument by the Maharaja of October 26, 1947. But one thing is clear: The constitution approved by the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir deals, among other things, with the affiliation of the state. This represents an important new element in the situation, and the Security Council is bound, in view of its previous stand, to take note of this. The position taken by the Security Council in 1951, in our opinion, remains valid, and we have adhered to it in this new resolution.

Finally, the United States lays stress on the final paragraph of the resolution before us. In the absence of a direct, mutually acceptable agreement between the parties, the Council has an obligation to continue its efforts, as it has in the past, to seek and to support any fruitful suggestion in this difficult case.

TEXT OF SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION^{*}

U.N. doc. S/3779

The Security Council,

Having heard statements from representatives of the Governments of India and Pakistan concerning the dispute over the State of Jammu and Kashmir,

Reminding the Governments and Authorities concerned of the principle embodied in its resolutions of 21 April 1948, 3 June 1948, 14 March 1950 and 30 March 1951, and the United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan resolutions of 13 August 1948 and 5 January 1949, that the final disposition of the State of Jammu and Kashmir will be made in accordance with the will of the people expressed through the democratic method of a free and impartial plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the United Nations,

Reaffirms the affirmation in its resolution of 30 March 1951 and declares that the convening of a Constituent Assembly as recommended by the General Council of the "All Jammu and Kashmir National Conference" and any action that Assembly may have taken or might attempt to take to determine the future shape and affiliation of the entire State or any part thereof, or action by the parties concerned in support of any such action by the Assembly, would not constitute a disposition of the State in accordance with the above principle.

Decides to continue its consideration of the dispute.

^{*} Sponsored by Australia, Colombia, Cuba, U.K., and U.S. (U.N. doc. S/3778); adopted on Jan. 24 by a vote of 10-0, with the U.S.S.R. abstaining.

The Question of a World Food Reserve

Statement by Hubert H. Humphrey

*U.S. Representative to the General Assembly*¹

We are convinced that our first task here in the United Nations is to be realistic.

If we aim at the possible, we will advance further than if we get stuck halfway toward the best of all worlds. It is not enough to want to do a good thing; it is equally important to do it well so that the highmindedness that we cherish does not fall into disrepute with consequent damage to the very purpose that we wish to advance.

It is in that spirit I want to discuss the item on our agenda and offer what we think is a practical and constructive suggestion. Before doing so, I would like to review the present situation and our attitude toward it.

Resolution 621, passed by Ecosoc at its 22d session last July, called upon the Secretary-General to report on the general subject of food reserves in order that the Council may once more consider this subject and thereafter transmit its recommendations to the General Assembly at its 12th session. This resolution of the Council was in the nature of an interim response to Resolution 827 (IX), in which the Assembly had asked that FAO [Food and Agriculture Organization] be invited to make a comprehensive report on past and present explorations of the feasibility of a world food reserve to contribute to relief emergencies and, at the same time, to counteract excessive price fluctuations. The Assembly desired that this study furnish the factual basis for the Council itself to report on the subject, with its conclusions, to the Assembly.

I termed Council Resolution 621 an interim response to this request by the Assembly because,

essentially, it calls for a further report and reserves the Council's own recommendations for transmittal to the General Assembly at its session 10 months from now.

The United States abstained from the vote on this resolution of the Council last July because, in our judgment, the subject of a world food reserve had already been adequately studied several times, both by FAO and by independent experts.

FAO's comprehensive report to the Secretary-General of November 26, 1955,² made it quite obvious that further study could not at this time shed any additional or different light on the issue.

The United States delegate in the Council made it plain, however, that the discussions had resulted in useful agreements among delegations on several important questions.

We certainly agree that a world food reserve could not at one and the same time help to relieve emergencies when and where they arise and systematically counteract excessive price fluctuations.

We also agree that rapid and balanced economic development would cure many of the ills for which we now seem to seek special treatment; and we further agree that food surpluses can be used partially to finance economic-development programs.

My colleague in the Council also emphasized, and I wish to reemphasize it here before this Assembly, that we have the fullest sympathy with the laudable objectives that the Assembly's initiative in this matter contemplates.

In abstaining from voting in the Council, despite so much agreement, our conviction that the matter had been sufficiently studied was supported

¹ Made in Committee II (Economic and Financial) on Jan. 11 (U.S. delegation press release 2583).

² U. N. doc. E/2855.

by the belief that the time had come for some basic decisions.

It was our belief that the time has come for governments to decide whether all that seems possible, in the present state of our development of international cooperation, is already being done to relieve acute distress due to shortages of food. Is it being done in such a way as to speed progress toward economic and cultural growth and to steady that progress? Could more be done? And, if so, how could it best be done? Which are the most practical means to an end that we all desire?

These, Mr. Chairman, are the questions that we must sooner or later answer. And this is the type of answer that Assembly Resolution 827 (IX) contemplates.

There are many programs and authorizations now in existence that empower the United Nations and the FAO to assure effective international cooperation and action in the case of emergencies. The many programs under which the United States has extended and still extends aid and assistance to other peoples are too well known to be mentioned here in detail.

As those of other countries, the Government and people of the United States throughout their history have given proof of a genuine desire to help other peoples in distress or misfortune. I feel somewhat embarrassed in saying this, because I know that most countries have generously acknowledged this fact. I nevertheless mention it because it shows that our negative attitude toward establishment of world food reserves has been concerned with means rather than end.

FAO's report has shown conclusively that, in any advance planning of international relief action, "the main problem is not one of having to ensure the physical availability of stocks by advance storage." Establishment of a physical central reserve involves practical problems that remain unresolved.

True, there is also another concept, that of an international financial relief fund—a pool of money or credit for the purchase of relief supplies anywhere in case of emergency (perhaps including pledges for contributions in kind), which the FAO studies found a more workable concept.

But there is no indication that governments and parliaments in general (including my own) would at this time be prepared to act and to pledge contributions to such a fund.

As FAO said of the earlier proposals, "Because of insufficient support [by governments] . . . no action was taken." This is where the matter still rests.

It is our honest view that the indicated techniques of approaching the problem at issue are not feasible at this time; the fact that our doubts are shared by other governments reinforces this belief.

Similarly, on the question of price stabilization, my Government is wary of more or less radical schemes of international regimentation, though fully aware of the dilemma presented by the need for flexibility to assure adjustments to long-run economic trends and the need for sufficient stability to avoid unnecessary short-term economic changes—both in the interest of economic growth. My delegation had occasion to refer to the problem of commodity price fluctuations in a statement presented a few days ago with reference to economic development in underdeveloped countries;³ I shall, therefore, not fully restate my Government's position at this time.

As I said before, Resolution 621 of the Economic and Social Council, passed at its 22d session last July, now stands as an interim response to the Assembly request. We must therefore await the final judgment and evaluation by the Council at its 24th session.

However, in order to draw attention to approaches that might add realism to the further studies and evaluations now in progress, I would like to suggest a specific topic to be included in the Secretary-General's report to the Council as requested in Resolution 621. This suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is being submitted by my delegation to this Committee in the form of a draft resolution.

Feeling as we do about these matters of practical approach to a purpose on which there is no disagreement, it is only natural that we would want to explore a number of avenues that might, in our view, contribute to a speedier and more adequate attainment of our common objectives.

The establishment and maintenance of more adequate national food reserves, especially in crop-cycle and famine areas, would go a long way toward accomplishing most, if not all, of the purposes that some of us had hoped a world food reserve or a world food capital fund could meet. The construction of storage facilities and the accumulation of reserve stocks in crop-cycle or famine areas would seem to be an essential step

³ See p. 236.

Text of Resolution on World Food Reserve¹

The General Assembly,

Having in mind the desirability of achieving the objectives set forth in resolution 827 (IX),

Considering that one of these objectives is the possible use of food reserves for relieving famine and other emergency situations,

Considering further that many countries may need to establish or increase national reserves for this purpose, and recognizing that many countries which are in the early stages of economic development are faced with special difficulties in establishing adequate reserves, such as the fact that levels of consumption in the less developed countries are generally relatively low,

Nothing that resolution 621 (XXII) of the Economic and Social Council requests the Secretary-General in consultation with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to report to the twenty-fourth session of the Council *inter alia* on the feasibility, and, if feasible, the manner of using food reserves for meeting unforeseeable food shortages,

Noting further that the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is engaged at the present time in a special study of the question of establishment of national reserves against emergencies,

1. *Requests* the Secretary-General in preparing his report pursuant to resolution 621 (XXII) of the Economic and Social Council to include, on the basis of his consultations with the FAO, an analysis of the possibilities and desirability of promoting, by way of consultations between importing and exporting member countries, the use of surplus foodstuffs in building up national reserves to be used in accordance with internationally agreed principles:

(a) to meet emergency situations;

(b) to prevent excessive price increases arising as a result of a failure in local food supplies;

(c) to prevent excessive price increases resulting from increased demand due to economic development programmes, thus facilitating the economic development of less developed countries;

2. *Further requests* the Secretary-General, in his analysis of the possibilities and desirability of the use of surplus foodstuffs for this purpose, to examine whether such use of surplus foodstuffs may lead to displacement of markets for those commodities and what effects it may have on the economic and financial position of those countries which depend primarily on the export of similar commodities;

3. *Requests* the Economic and Social Council to consider the possibility of postponing until its twenty-fifth session its examination of the report of the Secretary-General in order to be in a position to take fully into account the discussions and the expert technical studies being undertaken in the FAO concerning the establishment of national food reserves;

4. *Invites* both importing and exporting member countries to continue to consult through the appropriate bodies established by the FAO with a view to facilitating the establishment of national food reserves, with due regard for the FAO principles of surplus disposal, particularly the need to avoid harmful interference with normal patterns of production and international trade and to ensure that the use of surplus reserves will result in genuine additional consumption as defined in the FAO principles.

¹ Submitted by the U.S. (U.N. doc. A/C.2/L.297/Rev.2); adopted unanimously, as amended, by Committee II on Jan. 25.

toward general economic development. Surplus foods from abroad not only could in part finance the cost of the construction of strategically situated storage space but could also make an important direct contribution to providing the stocks that should be held as an emergency reserve. Moreover, if storage space were available, the local governments' task of dealing with domestic surpluses in years of good crops would be vastly facilitated, and years of abundance would become the blessing they should be, instead of the embarrassment they now are sometimes even in countries normally plagued by shortages.

Somehow it would seem only logical if some of the world's surplus holdings were used to bolster stocks in areas where the failure of a crop means

famine and where people live on the brink of disaster from one harvest to the next. What an impediment this condition is to progressive change in production methods has been vividly described by students of the problem. Farmers in these areas are not after the highest but after the safest returns, and they fear that any change in their production methods may bring hunger and distress. The elimination of this fear through the provision of reserve stocks and the creation of facilities for storing them would also have significance for economic development.

Fao's report eloquently describes the desirability of adequate national reserves in countries living near the margin of subsistence. Such reserves could be brought into action at an early stage of

an emergency, before panic and hoarding aggravate the plight. They would also afford some elbow room for projects of economic development; they could be drawn upon to help finance such projects—mitigating inflationary pressures of increased consumer demand resulting from intensified economic development. Unfortunately, the need for such reserves is greatest in the countries least able to afford diversion of output from current consumption to the building of stocks.

It is in the light of considerations such as these that my Government has authorized me to say that, in accordance with our traditions, the United States stands ready to make grants of agricultural commodities to countries facing famine or other emergencies. Furthermore, the United States is prepared to make available to needy countries, under existing legislation and subject to further congressional authorizations, surplus agricultural commodities for the establishment of reserve stocks to meet extraordinary needs due to crop failures or other emergencies or to mitigate excessive price effects of increased demand due to economic-development programs. Assistance of this kind is predicated on the development by the countries concerned of reasonable and realistic programs and of safeguards that insure the observance of the FAO principle of avoiding "harmful

interferences with the normal patterns of production and international trade." United States assistance in the above sense would be fashioned after previous arrangements entered into with several individual countries under which large parts of the local currencies received in payment for agricultural commodities supplied for building up national reserves were made available for financing economic development.

The United States Government is prepared to consult with governments of both importing and exporting countries through FAO's consultative subcommittee on surplus disposal and its working party on national reserves, with a view to facilitating realization of programs of this kind. The United States will cooperate with other countries in the further development of programs for the establishment of national food reserves.

Mr. Chairman, it is in order to stimulate a more rapid exploration of such possibilities for national action, with international assistance for purposes covered by Council Resolution 621, that we are submitting the draft resolution that is now being circulated. We should be happy if it would contribute to uncover additional realistic possibilities for action that serves the worthy purpose of improving the lot of the common man.

Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries

Statement by Paul G. Hoffman

U. S. Representative to the General Assembly¹

In listening to and reading the enlightened statements of my distinguished fellow delegates on the subject of economic development, I am struck by the widespread agreement on several subjects:

First, it is clear that article 55 of the United Nations Charter reflects the collective view of the international community that all peoples should have the opportunity to benefit from the wonders of modern science and technology.

¹Made in Committee II (Economic and Financial) on Jan. 4 (U. S. delegation press release 2576).

Second, most speakers have stressed the fact that the major responsibility for the development of a given country rests with the people of that country—that unless they, the people, are determined to help themselves and willing to dedicate themselves to that task, external assistance will not make a lasting contribution.

Speaking from experience, I would like to underscore this point. In administering the Marshall program we said repeatedly that "only the Europeans can save Europe." And it was the European people who did save Europe. Planning

and working together as Europeans had never planned and worked together before, they accomplished miracles in increased agricultural and industrial production and productivity. American aid was vital, but in no year did it represent more than 3 percent of Europe's gross national product.

Third, all speakers, indirectly or by implication, have made the point that the fight against hunger, illiteracy, and human misery must become more of a joint and several effort, with each country realistically facing its problems and each trying in good faith to make some contribution to the efforts of others. We in the United States attach great importance to this. The situation is not one in which a few favored nations can help all the others to raise their living standards. The problem rather is how the people of every nation can, without neglecting their own domestic responsibilities, find some way to offer outside assistance. For the burdens of none of us are so great, heavy though they may be, that each of us cannot find some way to demonstrate his sincere interest in the welfare of others.

There has been considerable diversity in the progress reports on economic development in the underdeveloped countries. Some are most encouraging; others express understandable concern about the distance these countries still have to go before their people can be adequately housed, clothed, and fed. Still others underscore the disparity in the per-capita income between the developed and underdeveloped countries. Without in any way underestimating the difficulties which still lie ahead, we are entitled, I believe, to rejoice in the fact that during the last decade more people have made more economic progress than in any previous decade in the history of man. This has been true in almost every country and in every area, and in some countries rather sharp economic progress has followed after centuries of stagnation.

Perhaps the most significant development in the underdeveloped countries in the past decade is one which was emphasized in the last world economic report of the Secretary-General.² As this report points out, this development is to be found not in the physical expansion of productive capacity, important though that has been, but rather in the gradual evolution of a climate favorable to economic development. The effects of this evolution can be seen not only in the marketplace but in

political and social institutions and, most strikingly, in the spirit and determination of the people and leaders of these countries to improve their status.

This new spirit is reflected in different countries in many different ways—in the new emphasis on the need for basic education; in the gradual modification of traditional social institutions which have hampered economic progress; in the beginnings of reform of budgetary and fiscal systems in order to encourage economic growth. While none of these steps may result in immediate increases in income and the standard of living, all of them are essential prerequisites if economic progress is to be accelerated.

The people of the United States have a deep and abiding interest in the efforts of the underdeveloped countries to improve the lot of their peoples. Perhaps that is because we ourselves were an underdeveloped country not too long ago. This interest has been expressed in a program of cooperation since World War II which has taken many forms and has been carried on through a variety of channels. The technical assistance programs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies; the developmental lending of the International Bank; the measures to encourage the international flow of private capital; the grants, loans, and technical assistance made available to underdeveloped countries on a bilateral basis; the special economic aid in the form of agricultural commodities to assist in carrying out development programs; the regional programs of economic development, such as the Colombo Plan; the steps being taken to make available the materials and the technical knowledge of atomic energy to underdeveloped areas—merely to cite these examples suggests the breadth and scope of this program of cooperation, a program under which the United States has made available to the less developed countries over \$8 billion for reconstruction and development since 1945.

Consider some of the developments which have taken place in this respect in the short space of the past 12 months: the establishment and beginning of operations of the International Finance Corporation; the negotiation and signing by 72 countries of the charter for an International Atomic Energy Agency; the appropriation by our Congress of \$1.8 billion for economic assistance of various kinds to the underdeveloped countries; loans by our Export-Import Bank of more than

² World Economic Survey, 1955, U. N. doc. E/2864.

\$650 million for economic development; and loans by the International Bank for similar purposes of over \$340 million.

Today, the continuing and widespread interest of the American people in the problems of the underdeveloped countries is reflected in the extensive series of studies now being carried on both in the executive branch of our Government and in the Congress for the purpose of throwing light on the most appropriate ways in which the United States can continue to assist these countries in grappling with their economic problems. These studies are concerned with such matters as the place of loans, grants, and technical assistance in any program of economic aid; the question of achieving flexibility and continuity in such programs; the use of surplus agricultural commodities to assist the economic development of underdeveloped countries; the role of multilateral, bilateral, and regional programs; and the stimulation of international private investment.

Role of Private Investment

Speaking of private investment, I believe that all of us are well aware of the importance my Government places on the role of private investment and initiative. This is partly because the United States was the beneficiary of private foreign investment in the early days of its economic growth. As a matter of fact, it still continues to be a major recipient of foreign investment. We speak from experience and appreciation when we emphasize the benefits which a host country receives from the inflow of technology and managerial skills that usually accompany private investment.

Worthy of particular note today is the fact that foreign investment tends to concentrate on financing the production of newer products utilizing the most advanced technology. An increasing proportion of American foreign investment in manufacturing enterprise is in such fields as plastics and electronics. It is these newer fields which attract the most dynamic and aggressive management—management which actively seeks new markets abroad as well as at home through production abroad as well as through exports.

While I am on this subject, I wonder if in all the discussion about encouraging private investment we may not have tended to focus too much of our attention on measures designed mainly to attract foreign investors and to forget the local businessman. Anything that discourages the local in-

vestors is also likely to discourage the investor from abroad. Conditions that attract one will attract the other. If the local businessman limits his investment to merchandise or real estate the foreign investor will probably be reluctant to invest his capital in that country. But if the domestic businessman demonstrates his own confidence by investing in productive enterprises, then in order to attract the foreign investor it is necessary to add only two factors. The first is assurance of equal treatment of domestic and foreign investors. The second is reasonable assurance of an opportunity to repatriate profits.

Unfortunately, we do not have any good statistical measure of the contribution of private investment to capital-importing countries. However, the United States Department of Commerce concluded in November 1954, on the basis of rough calculations made for Latin America, that "as much as one-tenth of the value of goods and services produced in the area may be accounted for by United States-owned enterprises. The proportion would be much higher for such industries as mining or petroleum, but even in manufacturing the ratio seems to be around 15 percent. Similarly, the ratios would be higher for a number of individual companies in the area.

"Some 25 percent of total exports to the United States by foreign countries is produced by United States direct investment companies abroad which have developed and made possible this large trade with the United States."

Moreover, in an attempt to obtain more reliable information on this subject, our Department of Commerce is at present conducting a statistical study of the employment offered, taxes paid, exports produced, and imports saved as a result of direct American investments in Latin America. We are convinced that this study, which is the first of its kind, will yield information of importance to our Government and to the governments of capital-importing countries as well as those of other capital-exporting countries.

When consideration is given to both the direct and indirect benefits of private foreign investment, the fallacy of overconcentration on the problem of the short-term balance-of-payment effects of such investment on the capital-importing countries becomes obvious. It is true, of course, that private investors insist upon the right to have a substantial part of their earnings transferred into foreign exchange. This should not, however, create in-

super-
result
vate
duct
chan
sary
inves
W
devel
nomin
those
defin
Thes
sourc
possib
abroa
as st
level
read
cultu
usua
comp
3 or
Th
impo
velop
ment
coun
the a
inves
any
exter
whet
aid—
proj
and
capit
tribu
inves
struc
both
coun
direc
indu
need
Th
of o
the
Thro
sure
lack

superable problems. I am convinced that as a result of the stimulation which comes from private investment in the form of increasing productivity there will be developed sources of exchange which will be many times the amount necessary to cover the outflow of earnings on foreign investments.

When we look at the experience of the underdeveloped countries since 1945, we see that economic progress has generally been most striking in those countries which have set for themselves well-defined and realistic economic and social goals. These were goals established in the light of the resources which could be mobilized at home and the possibilities of investment and assistance from abroad. They were concerned with such matters as strengthening public administration at various levels of government and the formulation of readily identifiable objectives in the field of agricultural and industrial development. These latter usually took the form of specific projects to be completed over some defined period of time—say 3 or 4 years.

This experience throws valuable light on a very important aspect of the problem of economic development. This is the question of what investment can be effectively utilized by underdeveloped countries to increase their productive capacity and the availability of the capital necessary for this investment. It emphasizes that the first task of any underdeveloped country desiring to obtain external assistance for its economic development—whether as private investment or governmental aid—must be to formulate sound development projects in which capital can be utilized profitably and constructively. Regardless of how much capital may be potentially available, they will contribute nothing to economic progress unless it is invested in sound projects. Clearly, the only constructive approach is to identify specific projects—both those which contribute only indirectly to a country's national product and those which make direct and immediate additions to agricultural or industrial production—and then to seek the capital needed to carry them out.

The way in which this problem arises in the case of our own assistance programs is illustrated by the operations of our Export-Import Bank. Through the Export-Import Bank we hope to insure that no sound development project fails for lack of capital from other sources to cover dollar

needs. The only limit on the sound loans that the bank is willing to make is the limit of the bank's own lending capacity and the borrower's ability to service dollar loans. Today the bank's lending capacity still considerably exceeds the aggregate of all applications pending before it. It is prepared to receive and consider more applications than it is currently receiving for sound development projects. Here is an important source of loan capital which we feel can be even more important for economic development but which is not being fully utilized apparently because a sufficient number of sound projects are not being planned for which such capital could be used.

Problem of Price Fluctuations

In recent statements, both to the Economic and Social Council and to the General Assembly, the Secretary-General has emphasized the problem of reducing fluctuations in commodity markets on which many of the underdeveloped countries are so heavily dependent. The problem of excessive price instability in primary commodity markets is one with which all governments must be greatly concerned. As to the desirability of reducing this instability, there can be no disagreement. The problem is how this can be accomplished without endangering other desirable economic objectives. In this connection, we agree with the view of the Secretary-General that no new international machinery is needed for this purpose.

Devices designed to reduce price fluctuations must be judged in the light of their effect on healthy economic growth. They may retard rather than promote such growth if they interfere with long-term price trends and introduce rigidities and restraints which make difficult the economic adjustments which are so fundamental to economic progress. In this connection, it is well to recall the warning sounded some 3 years ago by the United Nations experts in their report on commodity trade and economic development when they cautioned against excessive concern with *international* measures and emphasized the need for the pursuit by national governments of policies which would contribute to stability in this field.

As far as the United States is concerned, we shall continue to make our contribution to this objective in every appropriate way. We are continuing to work for the relaxation or removal of impediments to international trade. In the period since 1934

the average rate of duty on all our dutiable imports has been reduced by more than 50 percent. In the conduct of our stockpiling programs we recognize an obligation to avoid actions which would have disruptive effects upon world prices. In the disposal of our agricultural surpluses, we shall continue to take precautions to safeguard against the displacement of normal commercial marketings. We are assisting the diversification of underdeveloped countries—and this after all must be the basic long-term solution of the problem—through our financial and technical assistance programs and through our efforts to promote conditions favorable to an increased flow of private investment. Finally, we are resolved to maintain high levels of economic activity in the United States as a major contribution to world economic stability, which is so important if serious difficulties in world commodity markets are to be avoided.

Mr. Chairman, the objective of the economic policy of the United States in relation to the underdeveloped countries is basically a very simple one. It is to make the most constructive and effective contribution that we can to the efforts of the governments and the peoples of these countries to create in their territories the strongest possible national economies. For it is to the interest of the United States no less than of the underdeveloped countries themselves that weak and unstable economies grow into economies that are self-reliant and sturdy enough to make their full contribution to the maintenance of peace and freedom. If we achieve nothing more than this through our programs of economic assistance, our own interests will have been fully served. In the words of President Eisenhower himself, "We have no other interest to advance."

To this end the United States will continue to work with other countries to help develop societies marked by human welfare and a rising standard of living. We shall continue to help build up the productive capacity of free nations through economic assistance and private investment. We shall continue to provide technical knowledge and essential materials to speed the advance of other nations in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In short, we shall continue to work with all like-minded nations for the creation of conditions under which men and women everywhere can look forward to not only making a better living but also better lives.

Committee To Negotiate Agreement Between U.N., Atomic Energy Agency

The following resolution, sponsored by Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, India, Indonesia, Japan, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, South Africa, the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, and the United States, was adopted unanimously by the General Assembly on January 11.

U.N. doc. A/Res/450

The General Assembly,

Welcoming the unanimous adoption by representatives of eighty-one States, on 23 October 1956, of the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency,¹

Noting that paragraph 7 of section C of annex I of the Statute authorizes the Preparatory Commission of the Agency to enter into negotiations with the United Nations with a view to the preparation of a draft agreement governing the relationship between the United Nations and the Agency in accordance with article XVI of the Statute,

Desiring to initiate negotiations with the Agency with a view to bringing it into relationship with the United Nations, as provided for in article XVI of the Statute,

1. Authorizes the Advisory Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, as established on the basis of paragraph 5 of section B of General Assembly resolution 810 (IX) of 4 December 1954, to negotiate with the Preparatory Commission of the International Atomic Energy Agency a draft relationship agreement based on the principles set forth in the study² prepared by the Secretary-General in consultation with the Advisory Committee, pursuant to paragraph 5 of part II of General Assembly resolution 912 (X) of 3 December 1955;

2. Requests the Advisory Committee to submit a report on the negotiations, together with the draft agreement resulting from these negotiations, to the General Assembly, at the twelfth session, for its approval.

U.S. Delegations to International Conferences

UNREF Executive Committee

The Department of State announced on January 25 (press release 38) that Christopher H. Phillips, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs, will be the U.S. Representative on the United Nations Refugee Fund Executive Committee, which will convene its fourth session at Geneva, Switzerland, on

¹ BULLETIN of Nov. 19, 1956, p. 820.

² U.N. doc. A/3122.

January 29. Mr. Phillips will be assisted by David H. Popper, Deputy U.S. Representative for International Organizations at Geneva, who will serve as Alternate U.S. Representative, and by two advisers: Henry F. Nichol, Conference Officer, U.S. Consulate General, Geneva, and Wolfgang Lehmann, currently assigned to the U.S. Embassy at Vienna.

The United Nations Refugee Fund Executive Committee was established, in accordance with resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council, to enable the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to undertake a program designed to achieve permanent solutions of certain refugee problems and to provide necessary guidance to the High Commissioner in carrying out the program. The expiration date for the Fund is December 31, 1958.

The agenda for the forthcoming meeting includes discussion of the problems of the refugees from Hungary and of the Chinese refugees in Hong Kong. A revised plan of operations to be undertaken by UNREF in 1957 will be considered, and a report will be made on the fourth session of the Standing Program Subcommittee, which was held prior to the meeting of the Executive Committee.

The members of the Executive Committee are Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Colombia, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, France, Greece, Iran, Israel, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States, Venezuela, and the Vatican.

TREATY INFORMATION

Educational Exchange Agreement With Thailand Extended

Press release 32 dated January 22

In an exchange of notes the United States and Thailand have extended the agreement between the two countries dated July 1, 1950, to provide for a program of educational exchange under the Fulbright Act for an additional 2-year period.

The notes were exchanged in a brief ceremony in Bangkok by Max Waldo Bishop, U.S. Ambassador to Thailand, and Maj. Rak Panyarachun, Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand.

The action extends the program for a 2-year period with an additional expenditure of Thai currency equivalent to \$400,000 in U.S. currency. Since the original agreement entered into force in 1950, more than 70 American citizens have gone to Thailand and over 150 Thai nationals have come to the United States for purposes of study, teaching, lecturing, or advanced research. In addition, approximately 250 grants have been awarded to Thai nationals to enable them to attend U.S. institutions abroad.

In presenting his note, Major Rak stated that his country was gratified to see the program continued and stressed its benefits not only to the participants themselves but to the entire population of the United States and Thailand. Ambassador Bishop, in responding, expressed his personal pleasure in taking part in extension of the Fulbright program and added: "There is little of greater importance to the United States, and to the world today, than the free exchange of students and teachers which is such an effective means of enlarging our common knowledge and increasing our mutual understanding."

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Aliens

Convention regarding the status of aliens. Signed at Habana February 20, 1928. Entered into force September 3, 1929. 46 Stat. 2753.

Ratification deposited: Argentina, January 7, 1957.

Atomic Energy

Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Done at United Nations Headquarters, New York, October 26, 1956.¹

Signatures: Laos, January 17, 1957; Luxembourg, January 18, 1957.

Austria

State treaty for the re-establishment of an independent and democratic Austria. Signed at Vienna May 15, 1955. Entered into force July 27, 1955. TIAS 3298.

Accession deposited: Mexico, December 28, 1956.

International Court of Justice

Statute of the International Court of Justice (59 Stat. 1055).

¹ Not in force.

Declaration recognizing compulsory jurisdiction deposited: Norway, December 19, 1956 (effective October 3, 1956).

Morocco

Final declaration of the international conference in Tangier, and annexed protocol. Signed at Tangier October 29, 1956. Entered into force October 29, 1956. TIAS 3680.

Adherence deposited: Sweden, December 5, 1956.

Postal Services

Convention of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain, final protocol, and regulations of execution. Signed at Bogotá November 9, 1955. Entered into force March 1, 1956. TIAS 3653.

Ratification deposited: Spain, December 21, 1956.

Agreement relative to parcel post, final protocol, and regulations of execution of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain. Signed at Bogotá November 9, 1955. Entered into force March 1, 1956. TIAS 3654.

Ratification deposited: Spain, December 21, 1956.

Agreement relative to money orders and final protocol of the Postal Union of the Americas and Spain. Signed at Bogotá November 9, 1955. Entered into force March 1, 1956. TIAS 3655.

Ratification deposited: Spain, December 21, 1956.

Weather

Convention of the World Meteorological Organization. Done at Washington October 11, 1947. Entered into force March 23, 1950. TIAS 2052.

Accession deposited: Tunisia, January 22, 1957.

BILATERAL

Canada

Agreement providing for use of the Haines cut-off road for winter maintenance of the Haines-Fairbanks pipeline. Effected by exchange of notes at Ottawa January 16 and 17, 1957. Entered into force January 17, 1957.

Chile

Agreement extending the Air Force Mission agreement of February 15, 1951, as amended (TIAS 2201, 2929). Effected by exchange of notes at Washington December 28, 1956, and January 17, 1957. Entered into force January 17, 1957.

Turkey

Agreement amending the educational exchange agreement of December 27, 1949 (TIAS 2111), to provide for use of certain funds accruing under the surplus agricultural commodities agreement for the educational

exchange program. Effected by exchange of notes at Ankara January 8, 1957. Entered into force January 8, 1957.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Address requests to the Superintendent of Documents except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Radio Communications Between Amateur Stations on Behalf of Third Parties. TIAS 3694. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Nicaragua. Exchange of notes—Signed at Managua October 8 and 16, 1956. Entered into force October 16, 1956.

Economic Cooperation—Informational Media Guaranty Program. TIAS 3695. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Burma. Exchange of notes—Signed at Rangoon October 8 and 23, 1956. Entered into force October 23, 1956.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 3697. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Turkey—Signed at Ankara November 12, 1956. Entered into force November 12, 1956.

Mutual Defense Assistance—Purchase of Certain Military Equipment, Materials, and Services. TIAS 3698. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Ceylon. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington October 25 and November 2, 1956. Entered into force November 2, 1956.

Money Orders. TIAS 3700. 8 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the postal administrations of the United States of America and the Vatican City—Signed at the Vatican City November 24, 1955, and at Washington December 22, 1955. Entered into force November 1, 1956.

Agriculture. The Question of a World Food Reserve (Humphrey, text of resolution)	233
American Principles. The Price of Peace (Eisenhower)	211
Atomic Energy. Committee To Negotiate Agreement Between U.N., Atomic Energy Agency (text of resolution)	240
Congress, The	
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	221
The International Economic Situation (Eisenhower, excerpts from economic report)	222
Disarmament. General Assembly Consideration of the Problem of Disarmament (Lodge, texts of resolution and U.S. memorandum)	225
Dominican Republic. Disappearance of U.S. Pilot in Dominican Republic	221
Economic Affairs	
The Contributions of Turkish-American Cultural Relations to the Economic Development of Turkey (Warren)	214
Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries (Hoffman)	236
The International Economic Situation (Eisenhower, excerpts from economic report)	222
Korean Exchange Rate Discussions	220
The Question of a World Food Reserve (Humphrey, text of resolution)	233
Question of Cotton Textile Exports to United States (Eisenhower)	218
United States Sends Food Grains to Drought Area in Peru	220
World Bank Makes First Loan to Iran	217
Educational Exchange	
The Contributions of Turkish-American Cultural Relations to the Economic Development of Turkey (Warren)	214
Educational Exchange Agreement With Thailand Extended	241
Rumanian Refusal To Admit U.S. Election Observers	213
India. Security Council To Continue Consideration of Kashmir Dispute (Lodge, text of resolution)	231
International Organizations and Conferences. UNREF Executive Committee (delegation)	240
Iraq. Moslem Members of Baghdad Pact Consider Middle East Situation (text of communique)	216
World Bank Makes First Loan to Iran	217
Italy. Question of Cotton Textile Exports to United States (Eisenhower)	218
Japan. Question of Cotton Textile Exports to United States (Eisenhower)	218
Korea. Korean Exchange Rate Discussions	220
Middle East. Moslem Members of Baghdad Pact Consider Middle East Situation (text of communique)	216
Mutual Security	
The Contributions of Turkish-American Cultural Relations to the Economic Development of Turkey (Warren)	214
Defense Agreement Negotiations With Portugal Postponed	221
United States Sends Food Grains to Drought Area in Peru	220
Pakistan	
Moslem Members of Baghdad Pact Consider Middle East Situation (text of communique)	216
Security Council To Continue Consideration of Kashmir Dispute (Lodge, text of resolution)	231
Peru. United States Sends Food Grains to Drought Area in Peru	220
Portugal. Defense Agreement Negotiations With Portugal Postponed	221
Presidential Documents	
The International Economic Situation (excerpts from economic report)	222
The Price of Peace	211
Question of Cotton Textile Exports to United States	218
Publications. Recent Releases	242
Refugees and Displaced Persons. UNREF Executive Committee (delegation)	240
Rumania. Rumanian Refusal To Admit U.S. Election Observers	213
Thailand. Educational Exchange Agreement With Thailand Extended	241
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	241
Defense Agreement Negotiations With Portugal Postponed	221
Educational Exchange Agreement With Thailand Extended	241
Turkey	
The Contributions of Turkish-American Cultural Relations to the Economic Development of Turkey (Warren)	214
Moslem Members of Baghdad Pact Consider Middle East Situation (text of communique)	216
United Nations	
Committee To Negotiate Agreement Between U.N., Atomic Energy Agency (text of resolution)	240
Economic Development of Underdeveloped Countries (Hoffman)	236
General Assembly Consideration of the Problem of Disarmament (Lodge, texts of resolution and U.S. memorandum)	225
The Question of a World Food Reserve (Humphrey, text of resolution)	233
Security Council To Continue Consideration of Kashmir Dispute (Lodge, text of resolution)	231
UNREF Executive Committee (delegation)	240
World Bank Makes First Loan to Iran	217
<i>Name Index</i>	
Eisenhower, President	211, 219, 222
Hoffman, Paul G	236
Humphrey, Hubert H	233
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr	225, 231
Murphy, Gerald	221
Warren, Fletcher	214

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: January 21-27

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D. C.

Press release issued prior to January 21 which appears in this issue of the BULLETIN is No. 25 of January 16.

No.	Date	Subject
32	1/22	Extension of educational exchange agreement with Thailand.
*33	1/23	Dulles: death of Herbert Elliston.
34	1/23	Defense negotiations with Portugal postponed.
35	1/23	Exchange rate discussions with Korea.
36	1/24	Rumanian refusal to admit election observers.
37	1/25	Disappearance of Gerald Murphy.
38	1/25	Delegation to UNREF Executive Committee (rewrite).
†39	1/25	Program for King Saud's visit (rewrite).

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

TREATIES IN FORCE . . .

A List of Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States

The 1956 edition of *Treaties in Force: A List of Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States* was recently released. The publication lists treaties and other international agreements which according to the Department's records were in force between the United States and other countries on October 31, 1956.

The list includes bilateral treaties and other agreements, arranged by country or other political entity, multilateral treaties, and other agreements, arranged by subject with names of countries which have become parties. Date of signature, date of entry into force for the United States, and citations to texts are furnished for each agreement.

Documents affecting international copyright relations of the United States are listed in the appendix.

Information on current treaty actions, supplementing the information contained in *Treaties in Force*, is published weekly in the Department of State Bulletin.

The 1956 edition of *Treaties in Force* (250 pp.) is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., for \$1.25 a copy.

Publication 6427

\$1.25

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me copies of *Treaties in Force: A List of Treaties and Other International Agreements of the United States*.

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

6